DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 450 24 EA 003 637

AUTHOR	Miller, James L., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected "Developing Institutions." Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0431
PUB DATE	Nov 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080431-2999(010)
NOTE	110p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration, *Curriculum Development, *Educational Quality, Equal Education, Exchange Programs, Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, *Higher Education, *Inservice Teacher Education, Intercollegiate Programs, Interinstitutional Cooperation, Negro Colleges, Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

This document reports the results of a study to examine program uses and effectiveness in selected 4-year colleges funded under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The study identifies (1) promising programs or supplements to existing programs as a result of Title III funding; (2) probable reasons why programs are promising; (3) relationships between educational promise and such variables as level of funding under Title III, institutional characteristics, type of programs, and character of relationships with such external agencies as cooperating institutions and USOE; (4) relationships between types of programs (e.g., curriculum improvement and faculty development) and educational promise; and (5) other factors that appear to influence the impact of Title III activities with particular attention to factors that show promise for maximizing effectiveness. A related document is ED 035 105. (JF)

ED053450

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 8-0431
Contract No. 0-8-080431-2999(010)

USE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE III IN SELECTED "DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS"

James L. Miller, Jr., Gerald Gurin and Mary Jo Clarke

The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

November 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

EA 003 637

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

FOREWARD vii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Study 1
Purpose of the Study 2
Title III Funding Strategy 3
Sample of Institutions Studied 4
Procedures of the Study 7

II. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS 12

Interview Responses to the ISE Program 12

Positive Reactions to ISE Program 13
Class Size 13
Student-Faculty Relationships 13
Freedom of Expression 13
Financial Support 14
Low Attrition and Increased Motivation 14
Curriculum 14

Problems and Complexities 14
Living Units 15
Honor Roll or Dean's List 15
Course Credits 15
Transition to Junior Year 16
Extracurricular Activities 16
Selection of Participants 16
Selection and Organization of Faculty 16
Teaching Load and Salary 17

Relationships Within the Institution 18
A Concluding Comment 18

Introduction and Dissemination of Innovation 19

Problems of the "Outsider" as Innovator 19
The Insulation of Innovation 20

Upper Division Curricular Programs 21

III. PROGRAMS TO STRENGTHEN FACULTIES 23

Purposes 23
Uses of National Teaching Fellowship Funds 24
Use of Faculty Development Funds 25
Issues 27

Page

IV. PROGRAMS OF STUDENT SERVICES 30

Cultural Enrichment 31
College Placement Services 31
Student Exchange 32
General 33

V. ADMINISTRATION 34

Development of Staff Functions 40
Retention of Staff Within Institutions 41

VI. FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRES 43

Content of the Questionnaires 44
Importance of Title III Programs 45
Helpfulness of the Title III Programs 49
Impact of the Title III Programs 51
Factors Related to Feelings About Title III Programs 57

  Involvement in the Program 58
  "Quality" of the Institution 62
  Financial Level of Program 67
  Faculty and Administrator Role 69

Reactions to Bilateral Relationships 73

VII. SPECIAL ISSUES 78

1. Evaluation and Research 78

  The Measurement of Institutional "Potential" and "Quality" . . . 80
  The Measurement of Title III Institutional "Impact" 80
  The Need for Systematic Program Evaluation 81
  The Purpose of Program Evaluation 82
  Present Evaluative Efforts 83
  The Need for Federal Direction 83
  The Need for Cross-Institutional Research 84
  Researchability of Title III Programs 84

2. The Selection of Institutions to Fund 85

3. Title III Program Priorities 89

4. Relationships With Washington 90

  Problems in the Act Itself 93

5. Some Dilemmas Associated With the Developing Institutions Program 94

  The Dilemma of Basic Support Versus New "Innovations" 94
  The Dilemma of Defining What is "New" 94
  The Dilemma of Identifying the "Hopeless" Institution 95

Page

The Dilemma of Identifying the "Developed" Institution 95
The Dilemma of When to "Graduate" a Developing Institution out of the Program 96
The Dilemma of Geographic Isolation 96
The Dilemma of Small Grants 96
The Dilemma of Large Grants (Especially Multiple Large Grants) . 96
The Dilemma of Late Funding 97
The Dilemmas of Long-Distance Cooperative Relationships (Bilaterals) 97

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 99

SELECTED LIST OF RELATED PUBLICATIONS 102

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Title III Grants to Four Year Developing Institutions, 1966-1969 .	5
2	Characteristics of Sampled Institutions	5
3	Campuses Visited - Spring 1968	6
4	Characteristics of Four-Year Colleges With Title III Grants	8
5	Title III Grants for Cooperative Arrangements, 1967-1968	10
6	Number of Sample Institutions Represented in Each Title III Program Category	10
7	Perception of Importance of Title III Programs	46
8	Perception of Helpfulness of Title III Programs	50
9	Kind of Contact With Title III Programs	53
10	Amount of Contact With Title III Programs	54
11	Impact of Title III Programs on Individual's Work	55
12	Relationship Between Involvement in Program and Having "No Opinion" on Importance of Program	59
13	Relationship Between Involvement in Program and Feeling That Program is "Very Important"	60
14	Relationship Between Involvement in Program and Feeling That Program is "Very Helpful"	61
15	Relationship Between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Formal Contact With Program	63
16	Relationship Between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feeling of "No Opinion" on Importance of Program	65
17	Relationship Between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feeling That Program is "Very Helpful"	66
18	Relationship Between Financial Level of Program and Feeling of "No Opinion" on Importance of Program	68
19	Relationship Between Financial Level of Program and Feeling That Program is "Very Helpful"	70
20	Relationship Between Administrative-Faculty Role and Feeling That Program is "Very Important"	71

Table | Page

21 Relationship Between Administrative-Faculty Role and Feeling That Program is "Very Helpful" 72

22 Relationship Between Administrative-Faculty Role and Formal Contact With Program 74

23 Feelings About Bilateral Relationships of Predominantly Negro and White Institutions 75

24 Relationship Between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feelings About Bilateral Relationships 76

FOREWARD

So many people assisted in this project that it is impossible to recognize all of them. The institutions included in the study were generous with their time and expertise. The study could not have been made without this assistance. The staff of the Division of College Support, under the direction of Dr. Willa Player, provided valuable advice and assistance. Among staff members who were helpful in a number of ways were Dr. Calvin Lee, Dr. Charles Hayes and Dr. Paul Carnell. Mrs. Lynne Lurie was a professional assistant as well as secretary in the project office throughout the project. Mr. Theodore Marchese was particularly helpful in the early formulations of the study. The teams of interviewers who visited institutions did an able job, returning with more raw material than it was possible to adequately digest in a single report.

Although the purpose of this study was not to evaluate the adequacy of the total amount appropriated for the Developing Institutions Program administered by the Division of College Support, the authors feel constrained to express their overall judgment that the program is a valuable one and would be even more valuable if the appropriation for it were increased substantially.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Strengthening Developing Institutions, attempts to meet four particular needs in American higher education:

1. Improve academic and acministrative quality in "struggling" or "isolated" colleges and universities;

2. Increase higher education resources of the nation through assistance to struggling institutions, particularly those willing and able to increase enrollments and to enroll students with weak educational backgrounds;

3. Assist struggling institutions to overcome handicaps of (a) finances and (b) isolation, to help them enter the "mainstream" of American higher education;

4. Encourage interinstitutional cooperation and eventual consolidation as one means to the achievement of these purposes.[1]

Lawrence C. Howard gives an excellent summary of the evolution of this program in his 1967 study, The Developing Colleges Program,[2] and this history will not be repeated here. Key elements of the legislation and subsequent administration of the program are to promote equal education opportunities and to encourage interinstitutional cooperation as a mechanism to improve both quantity and quality in higher education. Howard notes especially roots of the program in early exchange programs and "big sister" relationships between southern predominantly Negro colleges and northern prestige colleges and universities, and assistance from foundations and other sources to predominantly Negro colleges in their efforts to upgrade educational programs and staff skills. Though designed to provide federal funds in support of these or similar programs, the Title III legislation invites applications from all "developing" undergraduate colleges regardless of geographic location or type of student body.

The first program awards were made for the academic year 1966-67. Much of the concern during these early months centered around the identification of "developing" institutions, the agony of deciding which institutions were eligible for Title III funds, culminating in Howard's 1967 study which attempts to quantify institutional qualities of potential, movement or change, and other characteristics which are usually considered to be related to institutional quality and potential. Meanwhile, however, as funds were increased from five million to 30 million for 1967-68 and the second round of applications were reviewed, it became apparent that the larger issue included evaluation of program content and effectiveness as well as identification of institutions.

---

[1] Strengthening Developing Institutions, Regulations (Revised-1967), Office of Education, and other materials concerning the Developing Institutions Program.

[2] Institute of Human Relations, The University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Project No. 6-1437, Contract No. OE-5-10-325, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The study reported on the following pages is an effort to look at program uses and effectiveness of Title III funds in selected institutions at the end of the second year of federal effort to strengthen developing institutions. Contracted by the Research Division, Office of Education, at the request of the Bureau of College Support, the study staff enjoyed complete cooperation from staff members who administer the Title III program.

Purpose of the Study

For 1967-68, thirty million dollars were available for Title III grants to more than 400 developing institutions. By law, 22 percent of the funds were allocated to junior and community colleges; among four-year colleges and universities, more than half the funds went to predominantly Negro colleges. About three-quarters of the four-year participating institutions are private. This study is limited to Title III programs in a selected group of four-year colleges and universities. The sample included public and private, and predominantly Negro and predominantly white institutions.

The purpose of the study is to identify:

1. "Promising" programs or supplements to existing programs as a result of utilization of Title III funds.

2. Probable reasons why programs were (are) "promising."

3. Relationships between educational promise and such variables as level of funding under Title III, institutional characteristics, the type of programs undertaken under Title III, the character of relationships with such external agencies as cooperating institutions and the USOE.

4. Relationships between types of programs and educational promise (types of programs include curriculum improvement, faculty development, administrative improvement, student services, and interinstitutional cooperation).

5. Other factors which appear to influence the impact of Title III funded activities, with particular attention to factors which show promise for maximizing effectiveness.

An important qualification in assessing each of these factors is that the Developing Institutions Program is by definition a "risk" venture in that its basic purpose is to assist institutions which have identifiable problems - institutions which are in some respects outside the mainstream of American higher education. Like the physician who could improve his record by accepting only patients with minor illnesses, the Developing Institutions Program is faced with the necessity of weighing its "success record" against its mandated mission. It would be remiss if it failed to accept some poor risk situations, but it also would be remiss if it did not give attention to monitoring its degree of impact.

It is appropriate to state what the present study is not. It is not an "evaluation" of the Title III program as such, nor is it an evaluation of any of the institutions which were chosen for inclusion in the study. We expected to find examples of both successes and failures in our sample. Our task was to identify as precisely as possible the factors associated with success or failure so that in the future the successes might be increased and the failures reduced. Partly this involves factors related to the selection of projects for funding, and partly the manner in which projects are organized and administered. Given the basic mission of the Developing Institutions Program, it is as important to identify and inform institutions of things they can do to make projects more successful as it is to inform the federal agency of ways they might identify projects most likely to succeed or fail.

This report comments upon the relative impact which various types of programs have had in various types of institutional settings and the factors which seem to have accounted for their achievements. We have attempted to structure the report so that as many as possible of the potential variables can be identified and considered. Among the more obvious are type of program chosen, institutional quality, quality of personnel in the institution totally and in the program itself, compatibility between the particular program and the institution in which it is undertaken, the availability of relevant extra-institutional assistance, and the receptiveness within the institution to innovation in general, as well as to the particular type of innovation undertaken.

When a federal program is new, it is necessary to rely exclusively upon informed judgments concerning types of situations that are promising; after several years of experience, it is possible to augment these judgments with an analysis of the degree of success and failure which previously funded activities have experienced. The present study was undertaken to give such an analysis. Its practical usefulness lies in the assistance it may provide when future judgments are made about funding various types of projects.

Title III Funding Strategy

In assessing the impact of the Title III program in general, it is important to note the changes in funding strategy over its first three years. In total grants, there was an increase from five million dollars in 1966-67 to 30 million dollars in grants for each of the following two years. Five million dollars went to 127 institutions in 1966-67, $30 million to 411 institutions in 1967-68, and $30 million to 220 institutions in 1968-69. At the same time, the average grant was increased from $39,370 in 1966-67 to $72,992 in 1967-68 to $136,364 in 1968-69. Along with this change in strategy is the fact that no grant less than $20,000 was awarded during 1968-69, although 48 institutions received smaller grants in 1966-67 and 40 institutions did so in 1967-68.

The nature of the grants also changed over the first three years of funding; in 1966-67 and 1967-68 approximately 62 percent of the grants were for cooperative arrangements, which increased to 82 percent in 1968-69. Within the cooperative arrangement grants, obviously there were large increases in each type of program between 1966-67 and 1967-68 due to increased funding of the program in general. Programs further increased in 1968-69 include administrative improvement, curriculum development, faculty development, and student services. Separate planning grants were awarded only in 1967-68. In the program type termed "other" (which includes joint facilities, learning resources, library improvement, administrative and/or indirect costs, and a miscellaneous category), allocation was almost three times larger in 1968-69 than in 1967-68. Money amounts of 1967-68 Title III grants to all institutions and to institutions in our sample (a subsample of awards to four-year institutions) are detailed in Table 5.

Sample of Institutions Studied

The design of this research combines elements of case-study, survey interviews and questionnaires, and expert judgment. The study is limited to selected four-year institutions receiving Title III awards during 1967-68. Subject institutions were selected because they were undertaking particularly ambitious or novel programs, or because they offered an opportunity to study a particular arrangement of interinstitutional cooperation. While an effort was made to include examples of all types of institutions, interinstitutional arrangements, and programs found in the total Developing Institutions Program, no effort was made to achieve a statistically representative sample.

Actually included in the study are 37 developing institutions located mostly in the south and in the plains states. This sample includes 30 private and seven public institutions, 16 predominantly Negro colleges, three consortia of colleges with full-time central office coordinators, several examples of bilateral institutional cooperation, and curriculum and service programs assisted by external agencies. Characteristics of sampled institutions are detailed in Tables 1 and 2. Campuses visited in the course of this study are listed in Table 3.

Table 1 summarizes the number of Title III awards and average grant size to four-year institutions in each year 1966 to 1969 and the number and average size of grants included in this study.[3] Sampled institutions comprise 11 percent of all grants to four-year institutions in 1967-68. The number of awards to private institutions as a proportion of the total is somewhat higher in our sample than in the 1967-68 population. The size of the average grant is also somewhat higher, probably because several particularly ambitious programs intentionally were included in the study.

Table 2 demonstrates that about 40 percent of the colleges and universities in our sample are predominantly Negro and about 45 percent of the sampled institutions represent bilateral cooperative arrangements. For example, a developing college may have a bilateral arrangement with a state university for curriculum development and faculty exchange, and may also be involved in one or more consortia of developing institutions for special purposes such as fund raising, career counseling and placement, or library services. For purposes of classification in Table 2, this institution is included in the bilateral arrangements group. Institutions in the consortium classification of Table 2 are associated with the Title III program primarily through a grant to one member of a group of institutions for programs proposed by the group and carried out by them jointly. Several of these colleges participate in smaller bilateral Title III grants (or unilateral National Teaching Fellow grants) as well, while others are connected with the Title III program only through the consortium.

Table 4 compares characteristics of all four-year colleges receiving Title III grants with the same characteristics in the 37 institutions under study. Though no effort was made to establish a statistically representative sample, these data indicate that the studied institutions as a group are very much like the total population on dimensions of average income and expense, enrollment, faculty-student ratio, and proportion of faculty with doctorates.

---

[3] The 37 institutions in the sample are represented by 31 Title III grants because some are part of consortia supported by one grant to assist several institutions.

TABLE 1

Title III Grants to Four Year Developing Institutions, 1966-1969[a]

	1966-67		1967-68		1968-69		Spring 1968 Research Sample	
	Number of Awards	Average Grant	Number of Awards	Average Grant	Number of Awards	Average Grant	Number of Awards	Average Grant
Public	28(30%)	$45,683	73(25%)	$105,349	51(34%)	$148,755	6(19%)	$208,580
Private	64(70%)	41,047	215(75%)	73,067	100(66%)	158,135	25(81%)	144,053
Total	92(100%)		288(100%)		151(100%)		31(100%)	

[a] Compiled from reports issued by Bureau of College Support, Office of Education

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Sampled Institutions

	Private			Public		
Major Affiliation	Predominantly Negro	Roman Catholic	Other Predominantly White	Predominantly Negro	Predominantly White	Total
Bilateral cooperative arrangement	7	2	3	5	0	17
Consortium of Developing Institutions	4	6	8	0	2	20
Total	11	8	11	5	2	37

TABLE 3

The University of Michigan
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Developing Institutions Project

Campuses Visited - Spring 1968

*Alabama A&M College (Alabama)
*Allen University (South Carolina)
Bellarmine College (Kentucky)
*Benedict College (South Carolina)
*Jackson State College (Mississippi)
*Knoxville College (Tennessee)
*Maryville College (Tennessee)
*Miles College (Alabama)
Millsaps College (Mississippi)
*North Carolina A&T State University (North Carolina)
*North Carolina College at Durham (North Carolina)
*Shaw University (North Carolina)
Southern University and A&M College (Louisiana)
St. Andrew's Presbyterian College (North Carolina)
*Tougaloo College (Mississippi)
Ursuline College (Kentucky)
*Wilberforce University (Ohio)

Atlanta University Center Corporation (Georgia)
    *Clark College
    *Morehouse College
    *Morris Brown College
    *Spellman College

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education
    Avila College (Missouri)
    Baker University (Kansas)
    *Kansas City Art Institute (Missouri)
    *Missouri Valley College (Missouri)
    *Mt. St. Scholastica College (Kansas)
    Ottawa University (Kansas)
    Rockhurst College (Missouri)
    *St. Benedict's College (Kansas)
    *St. Mary College (Kansas)
    Tarkio College (Missouri)

Nebraska Educational Television Council for Higher Education
    Chadron State College
    College of St. Mary
    Doane College
    Midland Lutheran College
    Nebraska Wesleyan University
    Peru State College

*Faculty questionnaires distributed at these colleges.

Procedures of the Study

In addition to the project staff, 18 interviewers were recruited[4] and trained to assist with the collection of data during visits to the institutions under study. All 37 institutions in the sample were visited during May 1968; the large number of interviewers was necessary in order to visit all of the campuses before faculty and students scattered at the end of the academic year.

Typically, interviewers traveled in teams of four to six and spent two or three days at a single institution. Interviewers used semi-structured interview guides as they talked with administrators, faculty members, students, visiting scholars, National Teaching Fellows, and directors of Title III programs. The interview guides could not be detailed because of the variety of people to be interviewed, each with a somewhat different relationship to a variety of Title III programs on a given campus, but did provide some direction for interviewers as they moved from one conference to another. The guides aimed aspecially to elicit institutional strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the respondent; the relationship of Title III programs to institutional needs and purposes; the operation, successes, and problems of specific programs; the nature and quality of interinstitutional relationships; and the respondent's evaluation of the utilization of Title III assistance as well as prospects for the future. In addition, interviewers were asked to make judgments about the quality of leadership and impact of Title III programs in each institution. A few students were included in the interview sample on all campuses where students were still in residence at the time of the visit.

Interviewers spent a total of 219 interviewing days talking with about 250 college administrators and staff members, 175 faculty members, 50 National Teaching Fellows, and 65 students or student groups. In addition, interviewers collected printed materials and factual data from each campus, and conferred with staff members in central coordinating offices and at established cooperating institutions. Detailed notes prepared by interviewers following their campus visits total more than 2,400 pages of typescript.

A brief questionnaire to obtain a broader sampling of attitudes toward Title III programs was distributed to faculty members and administrators on 21 of the campuses visited. Specific procedures and results of this survey are discussed in Chapter VI of this report.

Analysis of the data consists of statistical treatment of faculty questionnaire responses; quantitative and qualitative content analysis of interview typescripts according to kinds of programs, types of institutions, and types of cooperative arrangements; and case-study summaries of selected individual institutions and consortium arrangements. Particular problems for consideration are the identification of variables associated with high impact programs, actual and potential methods of evaluating programs, the extent to which experiences in these institutions confirm or extend the literature on interinstitutional cooperation and on planned change, and issues for further research. An additional focus of attention throughout analysis of the data is on concrete recommendations or questions for the Office of Education in relation to the operation and funding of this program.

---

[4] Most interviewers were advanced doctoral students at the Center for the Study of Higher Education or in other social science graduate programs at The University of Michigan.

TABLE 4

Characteristics of Four-Year Colleges With Title III Grants[a]

Characteristic	Private		Public	
	All Title III, Average[b] (N=214)	Sample Average[b] (N=30)	All Title III, Average[b] (N=70)	Sample Average[b] (N=7)
Income:				
Tuition and fees	$ 839	$ 831	$ 258	$ 250
Federal sources	62	44	63	44
State and local	20	-	722	787
Endowment	64	81	2	-
Gifts and grants	237	268	28	-
Total	$1,222	$1,218	$1,073	$1,081
Expense:				
General administration & expense	$ 307	$ 348	$ 159	$ 171
Instruction and research	582	662	558	623
Libraries	60	62	50	57
Operation of plant	155	166	140	194
Total	$1,104	$1,238	$ 907	$1,045
Enrollment	783	890	2,004	3,006
Faculty-student ratio	1-15	1-15	1-18	1-20
Percent of faculty with doctorates	28%	29%	26%	24%

[a] Data from bar graphs prepared by Bureau of College Support, Office of Education. 1966-67 data.

[b] Based on FTE students. Dollars are amount per FTE student.

Title III Programs Under Study

The various programs funded by Title III and included in this study are well described in the Manual of Instructions supplied to all prospective grant applicants during the spring of 1968. Programs eligible for Cooperative Arrangement grant support include:

1. Curriculum development: such as the introduction and development of curricula and curricular materials.

2. Faculty development: such as faculty fellowships for additional preparation for teaching, college administration, librarianship, etc, internships; institute participation; as well as the bringing in of consultants to the developing institution.

3. Faculty exchange: such as the exchange of faculty between developing institutions or between developing institutions and assisting institutions.

4. Visiting scholars: programs designed to make distinguished scholars available to the institution.

5. Cooperative education: such as the development of programs for student cooperative education.

6. Joint use of facilities: the development of plans for cooperative arrangements for use of such facilities as libraries, laboratories, educational television, computers, and other educational media.

7. Administrative improvement: programs including participation in academic administration programs and institutes, management institutes, measures for improving business office procedures, the development and fund raising functions, physical plant administration, auxiliary enterprises operations and nonacademic personnel administration.

8. Student services improvement: programs including operations of offices of admissions, counseling, testing, guidance, placement, college union, co-curricular activities and student exchange.

   Note: Such programs for student services should be oriented toward the development of student services staff rather than to the current generation of students only, so that the benefits will enhance the institutional strength and quality through the services of the staff.

9. Other: any other programmatic need which may offer promise for strengthening the institution which does not fall into the eight categories above will also be given due consideration.[5]

In addition to Cooperative Arrangement grant support, institutions could apply for National Teaching Fellowships as part of cooperative arrangements or as unilateral grants. The National Teaching Fellows program is described in detail in Chapter III, Programs to Strengthen Faculties.

Table 5 summarizes the distribution of Title III funds among the various program categories during 1967-1968 and indicates the sum of grants to sampled institutions in relation to all Title III grants for that year. Though the distribution of funds in the sample and the population are not exactly the same, again the sample appears roughly similar to the population on a variety of dimensions.

Particular programs considered in detail in this study are listed in Table 6, along with the number of institutions in the sample currently funded for such a program and the number of institutions reporting on such a program via the faculty and administrator questionnaire.

---

[5] Manual of Instructions, Application for 1968-69, Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965. U.S. Office of Education, p. 5.

TABLE 5

Title III Grants for Cooperative Arrangements, 1967-1968

Program Type	Total Amount Granted all Institutions[a]	Amount Granted 37 Institutions Studied	Amount of Sample as Percent of Total
Administrative Improvement	$ 1,047,658 (6%)	$ 102,570 (3%)	9.8%
Curriculum Development	8,875,359 (48%)	2,415,775 (62%)	27.2%
Faculty Development	4,588,025 (25%)	724,077 (19%)	15.8%
Student Services	1,029,591 (6%)	142,667 (4%)	13.8%
Planning	1,748,498 (9%)	50,000 (1%)	2.9%
Other	1,399,199 (7%)	448,263 (12%)	32.0%
Total	$18,688,250 (101%)	$3,883,352 (101%)	20.8%
National Teaching Fellowships	$11,311,750	$ 967,500	8.5%
GRAND TOTAL	$30,000,000	$4,850,852	16.8%

[a] Statistical Summary, Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education.

TABLE 6

Number of Sample Institutions Represented in Each Title III Program Category

Title III Programs	Number of Institutions	
	In Study Sample	In Questionnaire Sample
Freshman Program I	4	3*
Freshman Program II	4	4
Other remedial programs	4	3
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	10	8
Learning resources	5	3
Consortium programs	3	3
Faculty development and faculty exchange	14	9
Visiting Scholars	11	8
National Teaching Fellows	25	14
College Placement Services, Inc.	6	6
Student Exchange	4	3
Cultural enrichment	3	2
Cooperative College Development Program	3	2
Self-study and planning programs	8	4

*Number of respondents are noted in each data table in Chapter VI.

The next four chapters of this report will discuss in turn study results and conclusions concerning programs for curriculum development (particularly freshman programs); programs to strengthen faculties (faculty development, faculty exchange, visiting scholars, national teaching fellows); programs of student services (student exchange, cultural enrichment, college placement services); and administration (administrative improvement, cooperative college development, planning). Chapters following discussion of particular programs will present and discuss results of the questionnaire to faculty members and administrators, and discuss a variety of particular issues within the Title III program. The last chapter lists conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

A large proportion of the funds expended under Title III has been for the support of programs experimenting with new curricula and teaching approaches in the freshman (and sometimes sophomore) year. Across institutions and even within the same institution these programs vary greatly in their approaches and structural arrangements. Some, like ISE and CEAP, are coordinated and directed by outside agencies. Others are developed separately within each individual institution. Some are seen as remedial only for those students lowest in their academic preparation. Others are seen as ultimately directed toward a larger number of freshmen in the institution on the assumption that many are poorly prepared, requiring techniques and curricula that are innovative and more relevant to their needs.

Despite their many variations, most of these freshman programs have one common core. Implicit (if not explicit) in many of them is the assumption that a major and, in some sense, a unique function of these institutions lies in their serving the needs of students whose academic preparation makes them unacceptable to other institutions of higher education. Thus in its large support for these freshman programs, Title III is recognizing that one of its major purposes is to help the developing institutions find a special and unique function and raison d'etre.

There is little question, then, of the significance of these programs. The significance was particularly apparent in our questionnaires and interviews. As we indicate in our discussion of the questionnaire responses in Chapter VII, these freshman programs were overwhelmingly seen as important and useful. There was less questioning of their purposes and significance than was true with respect to almost any other Title III program.

The responses from the interviews support the questionnaire data on this issue of significance. The interviews provide a much fuller picture, however, and give hints of the complexities and problems in these programs, as well as their positive aspects. Before drawing some general conclusions from these programs, therefore, it may be helpful to examine and summarize the impressions from these interviews.

As a way of providing more focus to our discussion, we will organize our comments around the interview responses to one of these programs--the Thirteen-Colleges Curriculum Development Project, administered by the ISE (Institute for Services to Education). We have chosen this because it represents the most ambitious of these programs, one that has to some extent come to be viewed as a model for the others. The ISE also furnishes a good illustrative example because its direction by an outside coordinating agency illustrates the advantages and problems in such an approach, and because, despite this outside coordination, it varied considerably in the campuses we visited and thus provided some insights into institutional factors that affect the operations of these programs.

Interview Responses to the ISE Program

The Thirteen-Colleges Curriculum Development Project, administered by the Institute for Services to Education, was studied on the campuses of four institutions in our sample. As the program is described by ISE, it is the development of "an intensive, two-year, innovative curriculum in cooperation with 13 predominantly Negro colleges. The program is designed to bring the intellectual, social, and cultural development of students from socially and economically distressed areas to a level where they can compete successfully when they enter their junior year in college and in the larger society after graduation."[1]

While the curriculum and the innovative teaching methods used in the program are generally consistent with the way the program has been set up by ISE and by the faculty themselves at a summer institute before the programs were actually started on the campuses, we found certain basic differences and problems among these four colleges related to rather important aspects of the program. These, as well as the commonalities, will be noted in the following discussion.

In general, the interview responses conform to the positive impression gained from the questionnaires. General enthusiasm was voiced by the faculty and students involved in the program on each of the campuses visited. We will first discuss the phases of the program which generated positive responses in our interviews.

Positive Reactions to ISE Program

Class Size. Since the program is set up to include 100 freshmen and eight faculty members, class size is generally limited to 20 or 25 students. But it should be noted that while this is an important part of the positive reaction at some institutions, colleges which regularly have small classes experience the impact of the program in other ways. The factor of class size becomes interrelated with other positive aspects of the program, close faculty and student relationships and freedom of expression.

Student-Faculty Relationships. Both students and faculty lauded this rapport, noting the fact that with small class size they are able to work more closely with each other and to communicate more freely and more often.

Freedom of Expression. The Institute for Services to Education explains its innovative approach to teaching, the use of the discovery method, by saying that "if students begin to feel that they can speak freely, present their own wildest hypotheses, and explore ideas without fear of mistakes along the way, the technical difficulties in speech, writing, and academic content can be filled in as they are needed to find the answers to the students' personal questions. The new program at the 13 colleges is, therefore, based on an inductive approach to learning and student-centered materials." This method has a positive effect on students especially, and on faculty too (who in some cases still seem to be getting used to this method rather than the traditional lecture method); one even gets the general feeling that those involved seem a little overwhelmed by the fact that they really do have this freedom of expression--that, within reasonable limits, they can say what they want to say and what they feel like saying.

---

[1] Expanding Opportunities, Vol. III, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: ISE, July 1968, p. 3.

At this point it should be noted that the three factors mentioned above for their positive effects are also the cause of some questioning. One group of students in particular raised some interesting questions about the potential problems which these very factors might cause when the students go into the regular college program during their junior year. First of all, the matter of class size worried them. They were afraid that getting used to small classes and benefits related to this might make it more difficult for them to go into the regular program with more students in each class. Secondly, related to the close student-faculty relationships which develop in the 13-Colleges program, they again realized that this is less common in the regular college program. And lastly, they questioned their freedom of speech, realizing that the lecture method is more common in the regular college. They expressed the feeling that perhaps they would just have to stand up and have their say anyhow, even if this has not generally been done in the past.

The program is too new at this stage to know how the questions these students raised will be answered. But the issue they raise--what will happen when the ISE graduates enter the regular program--is critical to the whole question of the ultimate meaning and institutional impact of the ISE (and the other innovative undergraduate programs). As we will note below, it is an issue of great concern to some administrators and faculty at these institutions, and we will comment on it further at that point.

Financial Support. In assessing this kind of an innovative program, it sometimes becomes difficult to separate the impact of the program from its financial aspects. For example, a faculty member on one campus pointed out that he thought that the students in the 13-Colleges program are more highly motivated; but, he quickly added, this motivation may be related to the fact that they are receiving full financial support through the program. On one of the campuses we visited, it seemed that the financial support of the program had become the most important factor related to it. Before being an educational experience, it is a way of financing student attendance; it allows students to go to college who might not otherwise be able to attend. While this is important, ideally one would like to be able to say that the greatest impact of the program is its educational innovativeness. But for many of the people involved in it, money seemed to be of prime importance.

Low Attrition and Increased Motivation. The low attrition rate in the 13-Colleges program has been cited as a positive effect. To a great extent, however, this gets tied in with financial support--with money to stay in college for two years provided by this program, not many students drop out of school for anything other than strictly personal reasons. Here too, as has been noted above, increased motivation on the part of the students is clearly related to the financial support provided by the program. It is difficult to separate out the extent to which their high motivation comes from factors other than the fact that they are receiving money for tuition and room and board.

Curriculum. The interdisciplinary approach used in the curriculum of the program generally elicited a positive response, as did the variety and creativity of teaching methods and subjects covered.

Problems and Complexities

But for all of the positive remarks which were heard about the 13-Colleges program, there are also certain basic problems related to it. The overall question with such an innovative and basically experimental program is one of integration. At what points should it be part of the college as a whole? What functions should be separate, at least until they are shown to be beneficial to the entire college and therefore worthy of its adoption? The following problems related to this issue of integration of the 13-Colleges program into the regular college program are the ones which appeared on each of the campuses visited; while each college seemed to have solved at least some of the problems, others remained.

Living Units. At one of the colleges in our sample, the students in the 13-Colleges program were housed together in dormitories, separate from the students of the regular college. The general reaction was that this method had not worked and that they were going to abandon it after the initial year and move the students into the dormitories along with the other students. As a result of this separate living arrangement, some of the ISE students felt that they were often blamed for things which went wrong, especially in the dormitories. Also, this separation led the students in the regular program to think that the 13-Colleges students were being coddled or given special treatment. Remarks at the institutions at which the students did live together, with participating students having regular college students as roommates, for example, suggested that this housing arrangement is preferable.

Honor Roll or Dean's List. Another issue which illustrates the problem of integrating the program into the regular college program was the fact that some of the schools participating in the 13-Colleges program had a separate honor roll for the ISE students. This was resented by students especially, perhaps because the other students remarked about it. As noted by the interviewer, the students had mixed emotions about being singled out. It is difficult to feel pride about being on the Honor Roll when the other students taunt them and suggest that their separate list is inferior. Yet when there is only one Honor Roll or Dean's List, the fact that a larger proportion of the 13-Colleges students often appear on the list also leads others to believe that they are being judged on a different basis, and this too causes some friction.

Course Credits. Related to the curriculum, students in the 13-Colleges program at several campuses felt that they might be required to take extra courses, summer school, or even an extra semester in order to finish college in the normal four years. At some of the institutions in our sample, the courses in the 13-Colleges program are entirely different from those in the regular program, and as yet no definite correlations (between ISE courses and regular courses) seem to have been made for transferring credits into the regular program. The students felt that they may take courses in their first two years which will not get credit in the regular program and therefore will leave them behind in the number of credits earned. At at least one school, however, this was not the case. The courses have been set up as equivalent to those in the regular program, using the same course numbers and credit hours. They claimed that they can do this as a result of their selection process (the students are taken from those already enrolled) and the fact that their program is not remedial to the degree that it is on other campuses.

This issue of course equivalence and the granting of credit is critical. In addition to the time factor and the desire of students to graduate in four years, not granting credit for their courses underscores the remedial aspect of the program and the "inferior" quality of the students involved. As such, it has inevitable effects on student motivation and morale.

Transition to Junior Year. Along with the questions about course credits in transferring from the 13-Colleges program into the regular program at the junior year level, one found at some of the institutions that faculty members were questioning the ease with which the students will be able to make the transition into the regular program. Several of the problems anticipated by the students have been discussed earlier. Other comments were to the effect that students are learning by an interesting approach, but will they be able to get along in the regular program? Is enough being done to bridge the gap that will exist between the first and last two years? And will they be able to continue without the financial assistance which they are receiving under the 13-Colleges program? One thought related to this problem of transition was asserted by a faculty member who felt that the students in this program are exposed to more material in two years than the regular students are exposed to in four years. On the one hand, then, there is the hope that when they move into the regular program, the departments will expand their offerings to accommodate them. On the other hand, if this is done, will anyone else be capable of participating except the students who were part of the 13-Colleges program? And if they must continue as a separate unit, will the program itself have to be extended to four years?

Extracurricular Activities. At one of the institutions in our sample, it was mentioned that the students participating in the 13-Colleges program are not allowed to extracurricular activities. It is questionable whether this is something which is built into the program or just something found at that particular school. Students at another college indicated that they were the tops in everything outside the classroom, that the campus leaders and queens came from their group. At the same time, it is noted that the participants at that school volunteer for the program, and that perhaps there is some self-selection toward getting better students into the program by this means.

Selection of Participants. The question of how the students are chosen to participate in the 13-Colleges program is a relevant one. At least one of the institutions studied seemed to choose them mainly on financial need. Others took a random sample of those already enrolled in the freshman class. An institution which considered "admissible to the college" to be a criterion in the selection procedure also admitted that they had taken in some students who did not qualify for admission to the college. Another institution said that its participants were chosen from the enrolled freshman class but that they were representative, including, for example, a representative range of SAT scores.

Perhaps there is a need for a more specific selection procedure if we are to avoid certain problems regarding the financial and remedial aspects of the program. Sometimes the enrollment position of the school in general has an effect on this. For certain institutions, this program allows an extra 100 students to be enrolled whose fees are paid by the program. For others, it is a chance to take 100 students from the regular class and thus reduce the class size for such benefits as closer student-faculty relationships there too.

Selection and Organization of Faculty. As the 13-Colleges program is set up, half of the faculty members (four) are to come from within the institution and half (four) should be new to the college. This has not strictly been followed. One reason has been the late date for funding notification and therefore the difficulty in hiring new faculty at such short notice. Another reason this rule has been questioned and avoided is the feeling that this desire to get outside faculty members suggests that the existing faculty is inferior. Although the reasons for this kind of faculty selection stem from the fact that an innovative program of this type needs fresh ideas, fresh blood, and people not set in the existing ways of the college, some concern was expressed over this arrangement.

In the organization of the faculty, at certain institutions involved in the program there is a separate building for the ISE faculty and they do not belong to the regular departments of the college. While this does seem to foster more communication among themselves, it causes more distrust and jealousy in the regular faculty members and does not spread the innovative ideas of the program as readily. The institution which holds to such a policy of separatism feels that the institution is still experimenting with the program at this point, and, if it works and when the "bugs are ironed out of it," they will introduce it into the rest of the college program. But this means that there is little or no interaction with members of the same discipline in the regular college program. At another institution, the faculty in the 13-Colleges program are eligible for tenure in the same length of time as the other faculty members with the idea that if they are to be effective in spreading their teaching methods to the rest of the faculty, they will have to stay on the faculty permanently. Again, this is part of the more general issue of the degree to which the entire program can be integrated into the rest of the college program.

Teaching Load and Salary. To varying degrees, the questions of teaching load and salary have been the source of some jealousies on each of the campuses visited. At one institution, although the 13-Colleges faculty members should only be teaching within their own program, there was such a shortage of faculty in general that each had to teach one course in the regular program. While that institution claimed that one of the advantages of such a policy was that the teaching methods of the 13-Colleges program inevitably carried over to the regular program, this seems to be against the regular policy of the program. There have been jealousies in some of the institutions to the effect that the teachers in the 13-Colleges program have lighter teaching loads. It was argued that this is offset by the fact that they devote more to their work, that they actually work harder, although such assertions are difficult to prove to jealous faculty members. Another institution claimed that this question of teaching load did not come up on its campus, that the faculty members were used to such variations in teaching load among faculty. Some people noted that it was best not to advertise the fact that they had lighter teaching loads, that this was the best way to keep the amount of jealousy to a minimum. One institution said that while this was an issue when the program first started on campus, such jealousies had abated. And probably this will be true no matter what different and innovative program is introduced, for few men will be content if they think that others in similar positions have more advantages than they do.

The same philosophy applies to the question of faculty salaries. Some contradictions occurred even within an institution, with one person saying that the faculty members in the 13-Colleges program got larger salaries and the next person denying this. The members of the program were quick to say that the higher salaries were justified by their greater involvement in the program, but this too is not a very good argument to use with a member of the regular faculty at the same institution.

Relationships Within the Institution

We may conclude with a few comments on what our interviews suggest about relationships between students and faculty in the ISE program and the others at the institution. There does seem to be some interaction between students within the program and those in the regular program, as well as between faculty within the program and those outside it. There is some discussion on an informal basis, as noted by students and faculty alike. There is also the sharing of books, equipment, and materials from the ISE program with those not involved in the program. In some cases, students are also asking how to get into the program. There have been several faculty meetings on each campus in which the program has been described, but it was indicated that more of this is needed, to let the other faculty members and students know what is really going on within the program. But in general, interaction seems limited. In this connection, it should again be noted that the program is still in its beginning stages on these campuses, and one might expect this interaction to increase as the program gets more established.

A Concluding Comment

As indicated, we have used these impressions from the interviews around the ISE as illustrative of both positive aspects and problems in the innovative curricular undergraduate programs. While comments on other freshman programs differed in specifics, all tended to be similar on two major issues--that such programs were crucially important, and that they presented problems of integrating the innovative programs with the existing structures and personnel of the institution. This latter issue is particularly important, not only for the freshman programs specifically, but as illustrative of the general problem faced by all Title III programs, namely, how does one introduce innovation into an institution. In the following section, therefore, we would like to look at the freshman programs in the context of this more general issue.

Before turning to this, however, one final comment is relevant on the interview responses and what we feel we were able to learn from them. Perhaps nowhere as much as in the freshman programs did we feel the need for a more systematic evaluation to arrive at some conclusion about the effectiveness of the programs. This need sprang from the fact that in our visits to the campuses we got the feeling of great differences in the effectiveness of these programs at the different institutions, and yet realized that we had no hard data to support these impressions. In some institutions there were few or no attempts to get faculty for these programs who might have special skills in this area, wheras in others the faculty seemed unusually dedicated to these particular problems and imaginative in their approaches to curricula and teaching methods. In some of our interviews, faculty involved in these programs seemed unusually attuned to the problems they were dealing with and self-conscious and thoughtful about what they were trying to do to deal with these problems. In other programs the faculty seemed uncertain and confused. We found this variation in quality, imaginativeness, and self-consciousness of faculty even within programs like ISE and CEAP which were attempting to deal with these issues in a systematic coordinated way.

However, even where we felt faculty were unsually exciting and imaginative, we had to realize that we did not know the effectiveness of the program. The effectiveness of these programs is measured by what happens to the students in them. This seems an obvious point, but it is particularly important to stress in these programs, for it is difficult not to be convinced by the competence, enthusiasm, and imagination of some of the faculty involved in these programs. In most cases, there was no information on effects on students, although some was in the process of being gathered at the time of our interviews. Even in those instances, however, as we note in our section on evaluation and research, the evaluative attempts were sporadic and not completely systematic. As our first recommendation, then, we would underscore the need for systematic research on what happens to the students who go through these programs.

Introduction and Dissemination of Innovation

We have noted in a number of our preceding comments on the student and faculty interviews how the experience with innovative freshman programs highlights the problems of introducing and disseminating innovation in an institution. It should be noted that this is not a problem peculiar to "developing institutions". By their very nature, institutions of higher education generally make the dissemination process difficult. In contrast to other organizational structures, institutions of higher education are characterized by the greater autonomy of their subparts. In some ways this facilitates the work of Title III, since innovative attempts do not depend on institution-wide agreement, but can be made by some of these autonomous parts--for example, the arrangements that a given department can make with a parallel department at another institution. However, this same autonomy creates problems when one is interested in seeing the effects of the innovations that were created in one subpart, disseminated to the other subunits in the organization. In some sense the "developing" institutions, which are often more centralized in their control and authority structure, have less problems of dissemination than the more "developed" institutions.

Problems of the "Outsider" as Innovator

There is one sense, however, in which problems in the spread of innovation are particularly exacerbated in the developing institutions and in the freshman programs as well as other programs that have been supported by Title III. This is the great dependence in these programs on stimulating these institutions by means of "outside" innovators. This manifests itself in the freshman programs in the fact that the faculty tend to be people brought in for these programs, often young with only a one or two year perspective in the institution. This leads to [illegible] certain degree of insulation of innovation. Innovation gets identified with temporary outside people who, in the words of one of the people we interviewed, "come, shake things up, and leave." The fact that the traditional established members of the institution can identify change and innovation with temporary outsiders makes resistance to these innovative attempts much easier.

It is for this reason that we would support the kind of balance attempted in the ISE program where the ideal is seen as a fairly equal mix between faculty recruited especially for the program and faculty already in the institution. This should mute the problems of resistance that arise when a program is identified completely with outsiders. In addition, it serves another function. A major problem with using outside faculty, particularly the young ones who are likely to be most excited by the challenge of these experimental programs, is that these people do not remain in the institutions. If these innovative programs are to have a broad effect in reorienting the teaching in these institutions, it is crucial that faculty committed to staying in these institutions be involved in these programs.

The problem of the outsider introducing innovation is also faced by programs like ISE and CEAP that use outside coordinating structures, when contrasted with the freshman programs developed separately on individual campuses. ISE and CEAP had some obvious advantages in providing faculty with methods and techniques and enabling those from different institutions to get together and compare experiences. However, they also presented the problem of the "outsider." Feelings were expressed on some campuses about outsiders who did not understand the local institutional situation, developing and importing "canned programs." There was also an occasional complaint about usurpation of authority--for example, one instance where the person in the institution directing the program complained about the representative of the coordinating agency visiting the campus unannounced and meeting surreptitiously with the faculty involved in the program. Although certain courtesies in interpersonal relationships can certainly mute some of these issues, they are to some extent built into any program built around an outside coordinating agency which, by its nature, reduces the autonomy of each individual institution. In general, we would feel that the need for institutional coordination is so great as to overbalance some of the problems it raises.

Although we have continually stressed the need for coordination, it should also be noted that some of the freshman programs that seemed most imaginative were those being developed at the specific institutions. At the present stage of our knowledge where very little is known and the need for innovation and experimentation is maximal, it is probably wise to continue the present mix in freshman programs of those coordinated and systematized by outside agencies and those encouraging and supporting a particular institution that seems to be going in an unusually imaginative bent. At the present time we need a maximum of flexibility and experimentation. But for those programs that are being developed individually in different institutions, we would stress the need for the same evaluation procedure as would be carried out by ISE and CEAP programs. Even where the programs differ, many of the same evaluative measures might be used. Wherever possible, programs devoted to this endeavor should be able to produce evaluative data comparable to those being gathered in the other institutions. This would not only be helpful for the individual institution, but would insure that its experience would be available to all other institutions and of general use to people struggling with the problems that these freshman programs are attempting to overcome.

The Insulation of Innovation

There is always a tendency in institutions to insulate innovative attempts. This is greater when the innovation represents greater threat. This is true of the innovative freshman programs. Such programs present very special challenges to the existing departmental and divisional structures. They raise questions of the relationship of the special, often remedial, programs to the regular curricula, and the control of the traditional departmental structures over the curricula. As we noted in our discussion of the interviews, these issues get expressed in such specific questions as whether departmental credit ought to be offered for attendance in these programs or whether they should be viewed as something additional to the regular requirements.

Some institutions have dealt with these problems by creating separate structures for these special programs. For example, a number have created a special division of freshman programs headed by a person equal in level to the heads of the divisions of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. While the creation of separate and equal structures guarantees that these programs will have institutional support and will not be buried by the traditional structures, they do not handle the issue of how these programs can serve as the impetus for an institution-wide examination of curricula and teaching approaches. If anything, the creation of such structures exacerbates the problem of dissemination. Thus, the freshman programs provide a dramatic instance of one of the dilemmas in introducing innovation in an organization. Separate structures sometimes have to be created to by-pass the resistances. But this separation serves to insulate the innovative attempts.

Since Title III is still in its beginning stages, it is natural that institutions should have been more concerned with guaranteeing that innovative programs would have a chance to develop, that they would not be killed before they even began, than with worrying about their broader implications and impact. There is evidence that now, with a year or two experience, institutions are becomming increasingly concerned with this broader issue. We have noted this concern in comments of some faculty we interviewed. We also saw it very strikingly evident at a conference in Washington in September 1968, that featured a presentation given by students, faculty, and administrators who have been involved with the ISE 13-Colleges program. They expressed a great deal of concern over the dilemmas presented by the confrontation between the ISE programs and the traditional curriculum. The people at the conference had had one year's experience with the ISE program and were very concerned at what would happen to the students who, after having gone through the "freeing" experience of the ISE program, were now confronting the traditional textbook teaching. Students reported instances of this confrontation, their frustrations and discouragements and the tension that they were producing in their classes in challenging what they felt was traditional and inadequate teaching. A very prominent administrator at this conference, in commenting on the evaluation of the ISE program, expressed the feeling that the program was really being tested this year in the confrontation of the ISE students and the traditional faculty.

To point out the problems that the freshman programs present as innovations introduced into these institutions does not, of course, offer solutions to these problems. Given the complexity of these issues and the limited state of our knowledge, it is much easier to outline the problems than to come up with a set of recommendations about what should be done to encourage the broader impact that Title III is interested in effecting. We will have better answers to these questions after the experience of the next few years, as Title III institutions come to face and deal with some of these issues.

Upper Division Curricular Programs

We might conclude this chapter with some comment on the possibility for innovations in upper division programs. As we have indicated, the focus of concern has been on the lower divisions; but these institutions are now beginning to turn their attention to revisions of the junior and senior programs. There are questions about the directions that these changes might take and their relevance to Title III support.

To a considerable extent, the question of the direction in which upper division programs should go is related to how one views the purposes and effects of the freshman programs. If one views the freshman programs as a way of making up past deficiencies and getting students ready to handle the traditional curriculum, then upper division programs would be cast along more traditional lines and probably be less relevant for unusual Title III support. If one views the deficiencies as deeper, one would probably support the need for continuing the types of innovations attempted in the lower years, into the junior and senior years as well. Moreover, even if one did not view the problem in "deficiency" terms, one might argue for the need to carry these innovative orientations through the four-year period. We have shown that already there are some indications that the expectations created by the innovative freshman programs create problems when the graduates of these programs come up against the more traditional approaches in their later years in the institution. In the really successful freshman programs, one might be starting something that needs to be continually fostered if there are to be any long-range effects on the student.

If we view the issue of innovation in curricula and teaching as not specifically tied to the "deficient" backgrounds of the students in the developing institutions, it becomes clear that we are dealing with issues that transcend the problems of these institutions, but apply to higher education generally. The need for innovative teaching and the desire for relevance in education are critical issues for all institutions of higher education today. In focusing on these issues and developing programs to deal with them, the developing institutions have an opportunity to fulfill a very special function and purpose, relevant to higher education in general. If we view the developing institutions' mandate within this broader framework, we would argue for the significance of upper division programs in these institutions, particularly if they continue the innovative approaches now being developed in the freshman programs.

CHAPTER III

PROGRAMS TO STRENGTHEN FACULTIES

Purposes

Title III funds support four programs aimed specifically to improve the quality of the educational program at developing institutions by improving the competence of present faculty members and bringing in other people to teach in shortage areas or enrich the curriculum. Three of the programs are part of cooperative program arrangements: Faculty Development, Faculty Exchange, and Visiting Scholars. Together, these account for about 25 percent of Title III cooperative arrangement funds allocated in 1967-68 ($4,588,025). The fourth program, National Teaching Fellowships, may be part of cooperative arrangements or may be unilateral. During 1967-68 more than one-third of the $30 million allocated to the Developing Institutions Program was used to support the NTF program ($11,311,750). Four out of five institutions receiving Title III funds also received authorization for one or more NTF's. The proportion of funds to NTF's was cut about in half for 1968-69, to approximately one-sixth of the total Developing Institutions budget, but since the total number of institutions receiving Title III funds was also cut in half, it is still true that about four out of five developing institutions are allocated one or more National Teaching Fellows.

The "Manual of Instructions" for completing a Title III application for 1968-69 describes the following purposes as appropriate for grant support in these areas:

> Faculty development: such as faculty fellowships for additional preparation for teaching, college administration, librarianship, etc; internships; institute participation; as well as the bringing in of consultants to the developing institution.
>
> Faculty exchange: such as the exchange of faculty between developing institutions or between developing institutions and assisting institutions.
>
> Visiting scholars: programs designed to make distinguished scholars available to the institution.
>
> Functions of National Teaching Fellowships:
>
> 1. To assist, through full-time teaching, in the implementation of a cooperative arrangement.
> 2. As a temporary replacement for a regular teaching faculty member, releasing him to obtain additional preparation.
> 3. To strengthen an understaffed academic program.
> 4. To acquire a specialized competence such as teaching computer operation.
> 5. To add a new program.
> 6. To acquire creative, innovative, or stimulative talents.

7. As a tryout period leading to possible permanent appointment.

CAUTION: Care should be exercised to avoid violating the maintenance-of-effort provision of the Act. Federal support funds must not be used directly or indirectly to supplant regularly budgeted expenditures.

Uses of National Teaching Fellowship Funds

The "Regulations" for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 state that National Teaching Fellowships will be awarded "by the Commissioner to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculties of colleges and universities to teach at developing institutions for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years." The program hopes to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions. Prospective Fellows apply directly to a developing institution; credentials must be approved in the Division of College Support, with salary set by the program ($6,500 base pay plus $400 for each dependent) but paid by the employing college from grant funds. All National Teaching Fellows must have at least a master's degree; most are undertaking a first college teaching position.

Obviously, the National Teaching Fellowship program is designed to cover many possible faculty needs, and its use reflects this flexibility and multiple purpose. Twenty-six colleges in our sample had NTF money during 1967-68; the range of fellowships per campus was one to 12. Most of the colleges without NTF's were in the two midwest consortia. Of the institutions in our sample, only two colleges with bilateral cooperative arrangements did not have money for NTF's during 1967-68.

In many cases, there is little to distinguish NTF's from other new faculty appointments. Indeed, apparently often persons already employed for the following year were simply designed National Teaching Fellows, thus freeing some regular faculty funds for other purposes. Colleges justified this practice because the notification of funds came late - often April or May or even September - and this seemed too late to recruit good people not already identified as interested and available. Though colleges complained about the late notification of funds, in practice all but two colleges in our sample were able to fill all positions for the beginning of the fall 1967 semester. Often, new teachers designated NTF's felt honored, and the dependent allowances gave them a somewhat larger first year income; but, other than this sense of recognition, most NTF's could see little difference between their experiences (or contributions) and those of any other new faculty members of similar training and personality.

Those colleges that generally attract the greatest number of applications from prospective faculty and those near universities with a large number of graduate students and graduate student wives seemed to have the easiest time recruiting National Teaching Fellows. Those with greater faculty recruitment problems also found it more difficult to locate qualified people for these positions. When a bilateral arrangement was involved, very few of the NTF's seem to come from the assisting institutions and this is particularly true if the cooperative arrangement spans a considerable geographic distance.

A total of 26 colleges in our sample had grants for National Teaching Fellows during 1967-68. The NTF grants to eight predominantly Negro colleges with bilateral cooperative arrangements will be discussed below in relation to grants to these colleges for programs of Faculty Development and Exchange. Six of the other grants for National Teaching Fellows were part of bilateral cooperative arrangements (three at predominantly black colleges and three at predominantly white colleges), and 12 colleges in the three large consortia in our sample received unilateral grants for National Teaching Fellows. For these 18 campuses, the range for the number of National Teaching Fellows per campus is one to ten. Only two of these 18 colleges seemed to use National Teaching Fellows specifically to release faculty for further study; most of the rest used NTF's to lighten faculty teaching loads, develop new areas of the curriculum, meet increased faculty needs because of enrollment expansion, provide extra faculty members for innovative programs such as revised curricula in freshman English or science, and to replace part-time people on the faculty.

Use of Faculty Development Funds

Though Faculty Development, Faculty Exchange, and Visiting Scholars programs are separate in the application and allocation procedures, in practice it is frequently difficult to make distinctions among these programs. For instance, the Visiting Scholars program is designed to permit an institution or a consortium to bring in highly qualified and experienced faculty members at high salaries (up to $16,000 and higher on special arrangements) to teach courses for a semester or a year. But in practice often this money has been used for more short-term lecturers and consultants, while some of the Exchange funds have been used to employ full-time faculty members of Visiting Scholar caliber. For the most part, Faculty Development and Exchange funds are used to finance further study by faculty members on leave of absence, for faculty workshops or institutes usually connected with curriculum revision, as funds for faculty to attend off-campus workshops and meetings of learned societies, and to bring in consultants from the cooperating institutions or from other sources to meet particular program needs.

Eleven colleges in our sample have Title III grants for Faculty Development or Faculty Exchange. (Two have grants in both programs.) Counted as one of these eleven is a consortium; this grant really benefits a number of campuses in the sample. Two southern white institutions with bilateral cooperative arrangements have small grants for Faculty Development. In both cases, the funds are used to finance consultants for curriculum development projects and provide faculty released time to plan new courses and participate in workshops. These grants are from $3,000 to $14,000 each.

The other eight colleges in our sample with Faculty Development and/or Faculty Exchange grants are predominantly Negro colleges with bilateral cooperative arrangements. Grants specifically for Faculty Development or Exchange range from $33,000 to $70,000 per campus. Each of these colleges also has a grant for National Teaching Fellows, ranging from three to twelve National Teaching Fellows per campus. Use of funds on these campuses falls into three categories. First, on four campuses regular faculty members in numbers equal to National Teaching Fellows appointments have been released for further study and receive Faculty Development grants to support themselves and their families during this leave of absence. The NTF's serve as temporary replacements, making it possible for these faculty members to continue their degree studies. These colleges also use Faculty Development and Exchange funds to finance consultants and evaluators (coming usually from the cooperating institution), to pay for some visiting lecturers or short-term visiting scholars, and to permit faculty to attend off-campus workshops and meetings of learned societies. In general, these four institutions seem to combine Faculty Development funds with National

Teaching Fellowships to provide very explicit development and enrichment of the current institutional faculty and its curricular offerings.

In the second group, two colleges use some of these Faculty Development funds to finance off-campus study but mostly seem to use these monies and National Teaching Fellows to supplement existing faculty, provide some released time for regular faculty to work on curriculum changes, and in general to meet maintenance needs both in terms of faculty/student ratio and coverage of essential curricular areas.

In the last group, two campuses seem to use these funds and National Teaching Fellow funds entirely for maintenance purposes. At one institution the funds are used to bring in visiting faculty members from nearby institutions and therefore have some innovative value, though little in the way of contribution to regular faculty at the institution. In the other institution the needs seem to be so great and the confusion so pervasive that it has been impossible to use the funds for any purpose other than meeting absolutely basic maintenance requirements.

In our sample, grants for Visiting Scholars were received by four predominantly Negro colleges with bilateral cooperative arrangements and by two consortia. The consortia seem to have made good use of the funds. One has been able to obtain the services of several retired faculty members of considerable repute who spend a year conducting seminars open to students from all colleges in the consortium, lecturing, and meeting informally with students and faculty. Problems have been mostly timing - late spring is too late to identify and obtain commitments from outstanding scholars to spend any length of time on a developing institution campus as a Visiting Scholar - and the fact that students and faculty do not always make full use of the scholars while they are available.

One college obtains Visiting Scholars from its cooperating institution for a semester at a time. For the most part, these Visiting Scholars are used to meet regular faculty needs. The second consortium and other colleges with bilateral cooperative arrangements use Visiting Scholar funds at least in part to support visiting lecturers and other short-term campus visitors. Unfortunately, the largest amount of money for Visiting Scholars to a college with a bilateral arrangement was mostly unused because the institution did not have the necessary organization and support functions to locate scholars and make use of them on campus.

Comments on faculty questionnaires from eight college campuses indicate that the response to the Visiting Scholars program is generally positive but that the scholars are perceived as contributing primarily to the general cultural and intellectual enrichment of the campus (see Chapter VI). In contrast, National Teaching Fellows are perceived as helping to meet the teaching obligations of the faculty.

Some of the data tables from the faculty questionnaire provide further information about local perceptions of all four programs designed to strengthen faculties. Though obviously these programs are particularly relevant to questionnaire respondents, almost three-fourths of all respondents indicate they have little or no involvement with any of the programs (Chapter VI, Table 10) and more than half indicate the programs have no impact on their own work (Chapter VI, Table 11). Elsewhere we note a rather pervasive association between participation and perception of impact, and suggest that if Title III programs want to increase the breadth of their impact, they will need to find ways to increase the extent of formal involvement in programs. This seems especially true for programs to strengthen faculties, since only those assisted directly are likely to acknowledge any impact.

For most of the Title III programs, a high proportion of respondents directly involved in a program indicate they feel it is "very important" (Chapter VI, Table 13) and also "very helpful" (Chapter VI, Table 14). But this general pattern is not true for the Visiting Scholars program; only a third of those with official involvement, and less than a fifth of those with informal involvement, think the program is "very important." Even smaller proportions think the program is "very helpful" (24 percent and 14 percent, respectively). Table 21 in Chapter VI indicates that neither faculty members nor administrators feel the Visiting Scholars program is "very helpful." These data, in addition to data from interviews, inevitably raise questions about the value of this program, the conditions necessary for its success, and its place in the total Title III program.

Not surprisingly, Table 22 in Chapter VI indicates that the administrators who responded to the questionnaire are more apt to have formal contact with all the programs designed to strengthen faculty than are members of the faculty themselves. Faculty and administrators do not vary much on the importance they attach to these programs (though faculty are somewhat more enthusiastic about Faculty Development and Exchange). Neither do they vary much on the extent to which they think Visiting Scholars and Faculty Development and Exchange have been "very helpful" (Table 21 in Chapter VI). But administrators are much more apt to think the NTF program has been "very helpful" (54 percent administrators vs. 35 percent faculty members). Perhaps this difference is a function of the different degrees of contact with the program, but such data support the need to increase general faculty knowledge about and involvement with the work of the NTF's.

Issues

From the experience of institutions in our sample, it appears that the best use of Visiting Scholar funds occurs when a group of institutions can cooperate in both identifying and utilizing the services of such scholars, or when a very strong arrangement with a cooperating institution makes it possible to obtain Visiting Scholars on a regular basis from this major university. Otherwise, it appears that small grants for lecturers and short-term visits, perhaps up to a week or two at a time, will be better utilized than funds for appointments designed to last a semester or a year. Ind our sample, grants for Visiting Scholars ranged from $4,000 to $48,000 plus $101,000 to one consortium.

A major complaint from faculty with released time for further study under the Faculty Development program is that the $4,000 study grant authorized by the Developing Institutions program is not sufficient to pay expenses for themselves and their families away from home for a year, and is a special hardship for those persons attending northern universities with large tuitions for out-of-state students.

In institutions with specific, funded programs for Faculty Development, the National Teaching Fellow appointments had about a 50 percent chance of being used to release regular faculty members for further study, and in some other cases NTF appointments released regular faculty members for curriculum revision and the introduction of new programs or services. Where National Teaching Fellowships were not combined with such programs and funds for Faculty Development, they were almost always used to supplement regular faculty needs and to help maintain the regular functioning of the institution.

It is interesting to note that each of the four institutions most consistently using NTF's to release regular faculty for further study has a well developed bilateral arrangement with a prestigious non-southern university. Often, though not always, faculty with released time pursued further study at this cooperating institution, and sometimes the cooperating institution helped find replacements, either through NTF's or exchange arrangements. However, it was unclear which comes first - this sort of program determination on the part of the developing institution or the strong and encouraging assistance from a cooperating institution.

Faculty members holding National Teaching Fellowships often felt they needed more orientation to the purposes of the National Teaching Fellows program and, since many of them were going into college teaching for the first time, they felt more need for orientation and help to adapt to the professor's role. Several suggested the possibility of regional meetings of National Teaching Fellows and/or some sort of brochure which would describe their particular status and responsibilities. In many ways, NTF's need to be more consciously aware of the program and their role in it. Also, both National Teaching Fellows and Visiting Scholars suggested some more formal way for them to evaluate their experience at the end of their term, perhaps directly to the college and also to the Washington office.

Most NTF's carry a heavy teaching load, and many feel they cannot participate extensively in campus affairs or informal contacts because of lack of time. This is especially true of those teaching college classes for the first time. If the NTF is to contribute to the campus in out-of-class affairs, this should be considered when his teaching load is being determined.

Some mechanism to encourage young graduate students from a variety of graduate schools to apend a year or two as NTF's might also be helpful, perhaps even some central publicizing and referral office. Most developing institutions seem to get NTF's from regular faculty recruitment sources; the only exception to this seems to be occasional recruitment on the campus of the assisting institution. This hardly seems to be the intention of the program as described in the "Guidelines," but most developing institutions have neither the resources nor skill to recruit widely as independent organizations.

Many of the predominantly Negro colleges have faculty coming to them under auspices other than Title III - Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows, AAUP retired professors, foundation-supported professorships, etc. Both our interview data and questionnaire dataindicate some confusion about the particular status and purposes of National Teaching Fellows, perhaps accounted for in part by the fact that there are these multiple sources of supplementary college faculty on many of the predominantly Negro campuses, and also by the fact that during the college year most National Teaching Fellows are treated the same as regular faculty members, with a full teaching load and membership on faculty committees and all other normal faculty perquisites as well as responsibilities. There seems little or no effort to develop a distinctiveness about the program.

One effect of the late announcement of National Teaching Fellow funds was that Fellows could not always be obtained in shortage areas such as science and mathematics. Therefore, more often than not, National Teaching Fellows are in the humanities and social sciences. Also, apparently NTF's are almost always white, though many of them are teaching at predominantly Negro colleges.

All institutions in the sample, but particularly the southern predominantly Negro colleges, feel great pressure from their regional accrediting association and from state associations of higher education to increase the number of Ph.D's on their faculties. Sometimes, it sounds as though a college would be willing to take any warm body with a Ph.D. regardless of academic field or local usefulness. Many observers, and many staff at developing institutions, seriously question whether the rigorously academic Ph.D. is needed, or even appropriate for much of the teaching at these institutions, especially at the freshman-sophomore level. But the institutions will need legitimizing encouragement from institutions such as the Southern Association before they will begin to put emphasis elsewhere.

One criticism of the National Teaching Fellows program is that it does not help meet the institutional felt need for more Ph.D.'s, since usually it is not possible to get NTF's with a doctorate, though campuses sufficiently established to release regular faculty to pursue Ph.D. study should benefit in this regard in the long run. However, this criticism is related to the more general observation that NTF's seem to have little impact on institutions beyond the teaching slot they fill for a year or two, and the temporary/transient nature of their service can contribute little to the long-term needs of the institution. Though grateful for any help, these institutions need staff members with long-term commitments to the institution. The short-term value of NTF's is mainly in some time leeway for the regular faculty to pursue further study and work on new programs, in addition to whatever the NTF can contribute personally during his year or two on campus.

Analysis of our data leads us to strong support for those aspects of programs that broaden and strengthen existing committed faculty, and that develop new faculty who will devote more than one or two years to these needs institutions. Stipends for further study should be adequate to meet family needs; leaves may need to be longer than one year; close liaison with faculty members off campus must be maintained. Different mechanisms are needed to recruit and hold new faculty. An example of one such program utilizes foundation funds to underwrite the salaries of newly hired Ph.D.'s, assign them one course to teach, and let them spend the rest of their time on research. The program is phased in such a way that the first year all of their salary is underwritten; the second year, half, and the third year, one-quarter, on the assumption that as they work on research and get outside research funds, they will be able to support themsevles and their research activities on their own funds. This kind of program attempts to handle many of the recruitment problems of these institutions such as high teaching loads, lack of involvement in research, etc. Moreover, it also accents the unique possibilities of these institutions, which might also help in recruiting faculty. Another example of unique opportunities are in the freshman programs and other efforts to develop distinctive curricula and teaching-learning styles.

CHAPTER IV

PROGRAMS OF STUDENT SERVICES

Three kinds of programs aimed directly at students are financed by Title III: cultural enrichment, student exchange, and improvement of student personnel services. Cultural enrichment includes funds for lecture and artist series on campus, as well as funds to transport and admit students to cultural events in nearby cities. Two predominantly Negro colleges in our sample have funds specifically for this purpose.

Three predominantly Negro colleges in our sample have Title III grants specifically earmarked to support student exchange; others participate in exchange programs by using some money from Title III grants specifically for student life enrichment or bilateral cooperative arrangements. Some of the colleges in our sample have other private arrangements, including foundation support, for the exchange of students between northern predominantly white and southern predominantly Negro colleges.

Improvement of student personnel services is often included in grants primarily for other programs, particularly counseling and testing services in relation to new freshman year programs. An illustration of a direct grant in this area is a small grant specifically to support part-time counseling interns from a nearby university. But among colleges in our sample, the major program in this area is support for staff and materials to improve career counseling and placement services on several campuses. These grants supplement the work of College Placement Services, Incorporated, a private non-profit agency set up to help expand employment opportunities and career aspirations of Negro students. College Placement Services provides program assistance, workshops, and consultants who will visit campuses to evaluate needs and advise efforts to establish or expand career guidance and placement services. Generally, Title III money is used to employ a placement director and to supply basic program materials such as vocational guidance literature and credential forms. Grants generally run $8,000 to $10,000 per campus. During 1967-68, six colleges in our sample participated in this program (two in bilateral arrangements and one consortium); several others will participate in 1968-69.

Comparatively, a small proportion of the Title III funds goes to support programs concerning student services--about six percent of all funds obligated for cooperative arrangements during 1967-68, or slightly over one million dollars. Operation of the programs is largely administrative without much direct faculty involvement. Responses on the faculty questionnaire indicate that more than half the respondents have no direct contact with these programs (Chapter VI, Table 9), and two-thirds of them see little or no effect on their own work as the result of these programs (Chapter VI, Table 11), but roughly two-thirds of the respondents support these programs as being both important and helpful (Chapter VI, Tables 7 and 8). The student exchange program is the most visible and receives the highest proportion of supporting responses (71 percent important or very important, 67 percent helpful or very helpful); this program also receives one of the smallest proportions of "no opinion" responses though, as noted elsewhere, this probably reflects the popularity of the notion of student exchange rather than any particular knowledge of the campus program.

Cultural Enrichment

Several colleges in our sample reported marked increase in cultural activities on the campus over the last three or four years, sometimes supported directly through Title III funds and sometimes indirectly through the freeing of funds which otherwise would have been used for basic maintenance. Also, a few colleges have received private foundation support for a lecture series or program of concerts and plays. In general, the new cultural programs are viewed as desirable but not critical; probably this is one of the first programs that would be cut if Title III funds were no longer available.

From the faculty questionnaire, this is a fairly visible program but contact is mostly informal (Chapter VI, Table 10, only 17 percent of all respondents knownothing about the program). Two-thirds of the questionnaire respondents felt little or no effect on their own work as a result of this program. Administrators have much more formal contact with the program than do faculty (Table 22, 55 percent of administrators formally connected with cultural enrichment programs vs. 11 percent of faculty) and administrators are also more apt to feel the program is "very helpful" (Table 21, 42 percent administrators vs. 22 percent faculty).

For the most part, these funds have been used for traditionally accepted kinds of cultural activities (for instance, trips to the opera) rather than for encouragement and support of Negro artists or the development of a black culture, though very recently black culture has begun to be stressed on a few campuses. When there is criticism, it is largely along the lines that the cultural programs are not particularly pertinent to these student audiences, that students do not take advantage of the opportunities, etc.

College Placement Services

As indicated earlier, funds for placement services are used mostly to hire a placement director and supply basic materials for this student service. About a third of the respondents on the faculty questionnaire report no knowledge of or contact with this program, and express no opinion concerning its importance or usefulness. Along with the Cooperative College Development Program, which also is entirely administrative, the placement services program seems to have a lower visibility to faculty than do most other Title III programs. Of those who know about the program, most say it is important and helpful. A higher proportion of administrators than faculty know about the program, and they tend to be a bit more critical of it. Questionnaire respondents indicate 71 percent with little or no effect on their work (Chapter VI, Table 11).

Conversations with placement directors and others on the campuses indicate considerable awareness and concern about career choices and employment opportunities for Negro students. The marked increase in recruitment by business and industry, and by graduate schools, on Negro campuses has forced most predominantly Negro colleges to assign coordination of this service to an already overburdened administrator or, when possible, employ a new person to serve as placement director. But, while coordination of recruiters is an important administrative function, the greatest need on campus is for career information and counseling while will help Negro students explore a widening variety of career opportunities. Though the use of Title III money in this program is not very exciting--primarily for staff, equipment, and facilities--

it is a small expenditure on any given campus and appears to have considerable potential for impact on students when combined with the program and consulting assistance offered by the College Placement Services, Inc.

Student Exchange

Three predominantly Negro colleges in our sample have grants specifically to support exchange of students with cooperating institutions; several others have exchange arrangements financed by other means. This program is more visible than the placement program (only eight percent of questionnaire respondents express "no opinion" on its importance or helpfulness--Chapter VI, Tables 7 and 8) and two-thirds of the respondents indicate the program is both important and helpful. A number of faculty members feel that they have "informal" contact with this program, though fewer than one-quarter of the questionnaire respondents felt the program had any appreciable effect on their own work. Comments concerning the student exchange programs indicate that faculty view it as an opportunity for personal growth and enrichment of students, an experience which will widen their horizons. Comment concerning academic impact or influence is very rare.

Interview data indicate that an exchange program is perceived as a way to give Negro students experiences in northern predominantly white colleges and universities and to increase the number of white students attending predominantly Negro campuses. It is not surprising then that general impressions of the program by faculty who are not directly involved with it are more favorable than are responses of administrators and others more specifically aware of the problems which are involved in such exchanges. Interviews with administrators and with exchange students indicate that there are often problems of finances (for instance, sometimes students do not have enough money to cover incidental expenses on a northern campus), and program problems (some cooperating institutions have established special curricula for exchange students; where this has not been done, Negro students often have had academic difficulty in northern courses). Many Negro students would like to attend a northern college for a semester or a year, but often it is very difficult to find students at the northern institution interested in a semester or a year at the predominantly Negro college. Thus, it becomes very difficult to establish a true "exchange."

Apparently it is also very difficult to find effective ways for exchange students to share their experiences with others after they return to their home campuses. The students too seem to feel that the main benefit of the exchange experience is a personal one; the Negro students especially see the experience as an opportunity to test their ability to compete and get along with the "white world." Returned exchange students interviewed by project staff tended to characterize the difference between their home colleges and exchange institutions as one of facilities and attitude, rather than basic differences in people or in programs. They were stimulated and challenged by the experience, but found it difficult to communicate these effects to students who had not themselves participated in an exchange experience. Many were especially critical of the failure of faculty members to be genuinely interested in their experience.

At least two colleges in our sample are discontinuing exchange programs because they are so difficult to arrange as true exchanges and the gains do not seem worth the headaches. Tables 13 and 14 of the faculty questionnaire data (Chapter VI) indicate that a low proportion of those with formal involvement in the program feel it is either very important or very helpful. Generally, those involved in a program rate it higher than do those with no contact, but the proportions of positive responses are about the same for all groups when asked about student exchange programs.

Though a program with immediate popular appeal, both interview data and questionnaire responses in this study raise serious questions about the viability of these programs and, therefore, the wisdom of continued funding under Title III. Perhaps it would be better to avoid any possibility of false optimism by specifically excluding them; some funds might be diverted to cultural enrichment and made available for brief visits (a few days to a week) at a college campus different from or distant from one's own.

General

Most of the colleges in our sample have expanded enrollments and programs in the past few years with little or no change in their programs of service to students. For instance, almost all of these colleges express a need for expanded counseling and testing programs, particularly in relation to academic needs and achievement and for problems of personal adjustment. All are concerned to strengthen admissions staff and procedures, primarily in order to upgrade the quality of entering students and expand the geographic regions from which students are drawn. Procedures of registration and records are often quite inadequate.

Since most of these colleges still have fairly strict parietal regulations and are just beginning to encourage real faculty involvement in institutional planning and decision-making, a surprising number of them indicate that students are members on important college committees. For instance, several campuses include students on self-study committees and on committees to consider curriculum changes and on campus discipline committees. Most administrators express a desire to increase student participation in the decision-making process. Several campuses report considerable student involvement in community activities, such as tutoring and slum area rehabilitation. Many of the colleges would like to do more research on students but do not have the resources of personnel or funds to carry this out.

Though active in the early Civil Rights movement in the South, as of Spring 1968, students on predominantly Negro college campuses have not been particularly militant on issues such as student power. Interview notes indicate that demonstrations and protests during 1967-68 were mostly complaints about food service, dormitory hours, registration and business office red tape, and other similar concerns more related to inadequate administration and operation of the institution than to excessive administrative control. But there is no doubt that presidents and other administrators take seriously the potential for student disruption; presidents may talk back to their Boards of Trustees but they listen respectfully when visited by student delegations and generally make an effort to satisfy or at least to mollify the student demands.

CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATION

As institutions grow and mature the administrative support necessary to lead and sustain them also grows and matures. This truism has been humorously described by C. Northcote Parkinson and seriously studied by scholars. The inadequate development of administrative support in many developing institutions constitutes one of their most serious handicaps. It handicaps the effectiveness of current operations and it handicaps their ability to improve either via their own bootstraps or via effective utilization of resources made available by others.

The recognition that administrative offices and administrative personnel perform vital support and leadership functions which facilitate the central work of the institution--teaching, research and public service--is necessary to an understanding of the handicap under which underadministered institutions operate. The reason for underadministration most often is the desire to invest as much as possible of the institution's limited resources in the "central" or "core" functions of teaching. New money is invested in new faculty or in increases in the salary levels for present faculty. It is hard to criticize the priority of values reflected in this decision, yet it can prove self-defeating in many cases. Teaching faculty find themselves forced to do their own clerical or administrative work, and the quality of the work is often inadequate. A variation on the practice of expecting faculty members to do their own "supportive" work is to provide administrative personnel to do it but to do so with such minimal financing that the personnel employed to do it are not qualified to handle the job. The result is inefficiency of another sort, and frustration for faculty and students alike.

In all too many cases, the costs of underadministration are hidden. How does one estimate the cost of not having a qualified director of the college fund-raising program? The institution financial report does not carry a deficit item identified as the funds such a person might have raised, nor do faculty salaries carry a notation that they are lower than might have been the case had a fund-raising program been developed. How much does an institution lose (fail to save) because it lacks a qualified purchasing officer who knows how and where to order supplies or take bids or obtain discounts or quantity savings? No notation of this "loss" appears in the institutions financial statement either.

Even harder to measure are the academic inadequacies which cause students to be short-changed in their day-to-day exposure to educational experiences--inadequacies which might have been remedied with more effective leadership from the academic dean's office and other "administrative" offices directly associated with the academic function. Decisions about the amount and allocation of funds for faculty travel provide an obvious example. Major university professors are laughlingly accused of never being in their classrooms because they are always travelling for meetings, consultations, and speech-making. In contrast, the faculties of many developing institutions are in their classrooms too much. Lacking institutional funds (or institutional encouragement) for travel to professional meetings, they drift out of the main stream of their academic fields, become less and less aware of the changing emphases within the field and the current textbooks which reflect them. They are in danger of falling into a rut of repetitious teaching, year after year presenting the same ideas and information they developed when they first began teaching the course. Who is to say that the quality of education offered at the institution would not be more enhanced by allocating enough funds to faculty travel to help remedy this parocialism and isolation than by the addition of one more person to the faculty.

A similar situation often relates to the addition of books to the campus library. Except when the accrediting association is breathing down its neck, an institution frequently decides that book purchases are a postponable item in light of other pressing institutional needs. Repeated postponments become the pattern, the faculty (if it stays at the institution) adjusts eventually to the fact that the library does not acquisition many books per year in each field, and the teaching program adjusts to the library, which has adjusted to the budgetary situation. While one is hesitant to fault an administration for deferring book purchases and travel in order to raise faculty salaries or add faculty to lighten the teaching load, there obviously is some point at which the marginal benefit from travel and library funds are greater than money invested in faculty. Only an able academic leader can make these judgements wisely.

The development of adequate administrative support has at least two dimensions--quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative dimension refers first to whether the institution has a person to perform the particular function at all, and if so, whether the staff is adequately large to handle the volume of business. The qualitative dimension refers to the level of performance of the staff. Developing institutions have serious problems along both dimensions. (Nearly all other institutions do, too, but to a lesser extent.)

The differentiation of administrative and quasi-administrative tasks and their distribution among a growing number of specialists in American colleges and universities can be viewed historically and it can be viewed functionally. As recently as the time of the Civil War, one hundred years ago, college administration was largely a one-man affair, with the president performing all the tasks and teaching as well. The order in which specialized administrative personnel appeared varied from one campus to another, but they typically involved first a separate librarian, then a registrar to keep the academic records, then the dean, and later student personnel officers, business officers, directors of public relations, directors of admissions, and many others. As institutions grew in size and complexity each of these functions developed subspecializations as well as the need for increasing numbers of clerical, secretarial, and technical assistance.

Viewed functionally rather than historically, the development of administrative specialization can be described as progressing through a series of stages which provide initially for the productive activity for which the organization was established (teaching in the case of most colleges) and subsequently move to develop supporting structures to assist the productive enterprise through dependable management, structures for the maintenance and smooth running of the system, and eventually structures for dealing effectively with the world outside the institution itself through better systems for procurement, disposal, and institutional relations.

However one views the process, it is apparent that developing institutions, like all other colleges and universities, have felt the need for some of these offices and functionaries and have moved to establish them, but that they do not have all that the experience of other institutions suggest they will need, nor are existing offices adequately staffed with fully qualified personnel.

The Developing Institutions Program has addressed itself to some of these needs, with varying degrees of success. There is need for greater attention to this area. There has not been a great interest within the developing institutions themselves for activities directed toward administrative improvement. One can surmise about the reasons--the true cause is probably a combination of them. The present administrative personnel, for selfless reasons, may want greatest attention directed to the improvement of the core functions of the institution--notably the teaching program. These are the areas in which new institutional resources in the past have been concentrated, and they come naturally to mind when one begins to think in terms of further ways in which the institutional situation might be bettered. Administrative improvement activities might be viewed by the rest of the campus as self-aggrandizing, since administrative people often are involved in the development and approval of institutional improvement program requests. Finally, administrative improvement functions have, in the term itself, the implication that administration needs improving, i.e., is less than adequate, and this is hard on the ego. None of these reasons are incompatible with the others, though some undoubtedly are more important than others at individual campuses.

Programs for administrative improvement have been viewed by the Washington staff of the Developing Institutions Program as warranting greater expansion than institutional requests have actually made possible.

One point at which potential programs for administrative improvement have lost out has been in the negotiations stage after the initial award of a grant. The large number of applications and the limited funds available to the Developing Institutions Program frequently create the situation in which institutional grants are for less than the total requested by the institution. This leads to negotiations over what parts of the request to fund. When an institution has been awarded a grant smaller than its total request, the institution is asked to indicate which of the activities it originally proposed are most important to it. Although this negotiation procedure is designed as a give-and-take between institutional personnel and the Washington staff, in practice the decision has been left largely to the institution (so long as the Washington staff did not view any of the proposed activities as totally unacceptable for funding). Institutional choices often have eliminated the administrative improvement activities, probably on the same grounds that administrative improvements financed from the institution's own funds also have generally taken a back seat to academic improvement (see discussion above). Once again, who is to say "No" to this judgement. Yet question should be raised in at least some instances as to whether the marginal value might not be greatest if administrative improvement were undertaken.

The expertise of the Washington staff and of the members of the panels which read the applications could play a far more important role than it does in guiding the entire process and specifically in encouraging more emphasis upon administrative improvement. Both the Washington staff and many of the panel members (certainly the panels as groups) have a wide perspective concerning institutions in various stages of development, to say nothing of the opportunity to observe in many institutions the kinds of things which have greater or lesser likelihood of success. This expertise needs to be made more available to the institutions. This matter is covered more fully in a section devoted specifically to it, but it is worth noting here that the deemphasis on "Washington involvement" in the operation of the Developing Institutions Program is great enough that it needs rethinking. Unusual as the case may be, this appears to be an instance in which institutional recipients of Federal funds would benefit greatly from, and in many cases are anxious for, greater guidance from technically competent Federal officials.

The typical administrative improvement program in many institutions has involved an exchange of visits between the counterpart functionaries in the developing institution and the assisting institution. This exchange of visits, sometimes for as long as a week at each institution, has been favorably reported on to us by a number of developing institution administrators. It provided an opportunity to see first-hand how things are done at another institution--presumably an institution where things are being done well. Unfortunately, the usual arrangement between institutions introduced great disparities of size and complexity, so that the transferability of procedures from the assisting institution to the developing institution is limited. Nevertheless, it is judged worthwhile (often extremely worthwhile) by most of those who have taken part in such exchanges. The visit to the developing institution campus by the counterpart official has additional and somewhat different benefits, since he may have suggestions which are applicable to the smaller situation beyond those he employs in his own institution.

Unfortunately, most administrative improvement programs end after the exchange of visits. There are vague references to possibly doing it again sometime, and occasionally there are references to the counterpart administrator as a possible source of expert advise on particular problems, should the administrator in the developing institutions ever want to draw upon it. Beyond that there seems to be little further follow-up--indeed, little real idea of what more might be accomplished by follow-up. A few exceptions exist. In a few cases the counterpart individuals, as individuals, happen to have struck it off well personally and professionally, and there developed a continuing collegial exchange of letters, requests for advice and consultative assistance, and professionally profitable get-togethers at national professional meetings. In other instances the relationship has continued with a program of cooperative internships under which the assisting institution helps to identify prospective interns in technical or administrative fields who spend a year or two at the developing institution. In effect, these individuals serve as supplementary staff, often bringing with them some special expertise such as knowledge of computer technology. These cases are the exceptions, however. At most institutions cooperative programs for administrative improvement have not gone further than the exchange of visits.

Administrative improvement is an area in which some imaginative ideas are needed.

One fact which intrudes over and over as one views the administrative operations at many developing institutions is the need which each of the administrative functionaries has for access to greater expertise in his own field through association with others performing the same function in other institutions and through association with national experts who have learned the technique as well. This is simply another facet of the problem of isolation which is a pervasive problem at nearly all developing institutions--isolation borne of small institutional size (which means the functionaries in any specific area are few) and augmented by institutional poverty which limits the availability of funds for travel which would facilitate association with similar functionaries from other institutions. Poverty also limits money to purchase books and professional association memberships, let alone consultative assistance. One further element in this isolation as it affects administrators is the fact that a number (not all) of administrators in small and/or poor institutions are individuals chosen not for their expertise in the functional area but because of their loyalty and their willingness to work at the particular institution in whatever capacity they are needed.

All too often these several factors compound one another so that one meets a picture of an individual whose background was not originally relevant to the position he now holds, who was placed in that position because the college needed him and he was willing to serve, who had little chance to learn the technique for doing his job except on the basis of the way it was done when he inherited it. He may or may not belong to the appropriate professional organizations in his field and subscribe to its professional journals. If he does, he may or may not attempt to actually utilize ideas gained from those sources in his own operation. He is a "seat of the pants" administrator, who, as time goes by, may become reasonably "expert" because of his long "experience." The judgement of his degree of expertness is principally made by others at the college in other functional positions rather than by counterpart functionaries in other institutions, and therefore, the basis for the judgment is suspect.

The picture is by no means totally bleak, but it presents obvious problems, some of which suggest fairly obvious kinds of solutions. For example, the possibilities for inservice education programs which bring together the counterpart functionaries from a number of reasonably similar institutions within a limited geographic area would permit the exchange of ideas with true peers. The use in such a program of outside experts who are familiar with the size and type of institution in question would introduce into the process norms about acceptable types and levels of practice plus new ideas still in the experimental stage. The active involvement of the administrative people themselves in the identification of topics for study and in the development of the program and the selection of expert speakers could do much to generate enthusiasm and allay fears that participation connoted an admission of initial inadequacy in one's job. One cannot expect that such activities will spring up spontaneously. They must be actively encouraged by a national body--the staff of Developing Institutions Program itself, a national service agency (consortia), or the professional organizations in the respective fields. Active encouragement from the Developing Institutions Program officials obviously will be needed to encourage any substantial degree of activity along this line, however.

Among the possibilities for administrative improvement programs, the following are illustrative:

Groups of chief business officers (and/or their subordinates and assistants) could work together in a continuing series of workshops on the improvement of business operations, with individual workshop sessions devoted to separate topics. The assistance and cooperation of the National Association of College and University Business Officers might be solicited to assist in the project, possibly serving as its sponsor. In order to reduce travel expenses and promote continuity of contact among business officers, subgroups of officers from contiguous geographic areas could be organized, possibly of officers from institutions of similar size and complexity, possibly from all of the institutions in an area.

Programs for academic deans are as varied in their possibilities as are those for business officers. Some deans need assistance in better ways to approach the basic responsibilities of the deanship. In addition, they could benefit greatly from programs dealing with particular types of innovations, with special attention to their possible relevance to developing institutions. New curricular groupings, forms of black studies programs, various calendar arrangements, constitute three out of a long list of possibilities.

Registrars perform the "academic bookkeeping" function. All too often it is assumed that the function, once learned, never changes. New developments affecting registrars occur regularly, and programs to bring these developments to the attention of registrars are needed. Registrars, like accountants, get the reputation for being always accurate but rigid and unbending in their procedures. This is far from true--at least insofar as good registrars are concerned--but registrars have a sufficient sense of the importance of their function (and its accuracy) that they do not make changes in it lightly. All the more reason for serious programs of continuing education which bring them up to date, keep them up to date, and inform them about precisely how new techniques can be adopted in ways that will mesh properly with existing procedures.

Similar arrangements might be made for purchasing officers, directors of plant operations and maintenance, librarians, admissions officers, academic deans, student personnel officers, food service administrators, dormitory administrators and counselors, etc. Most of these groups have active professional organizations in their specialized fields, and the cooperation of these organizations should be solicited. In addition, there are university-based educational programs in a number of these fields of specialization and short-course workshops available in others. The sponsors of these already established educational programs may well be willing to cooperate in new and more intensive forms of continuing education such as would be possible with the assistance of the Title III program.

Another possibility would be the development of special programs which focus upon problems that cut across several administrative specialties and for which the appropriate institutional participation would be a team from each institution representative of administrators responsible for the functional specialties affected by the problem. Such team participation in workshop and continuing education experiences has assisted in the past in bringing about acceptance of new ideas which require the understanding and agreement of several major institutional offices before being implemented The topic of institutional budget-making suggests itself as one in which many officials are importantly involved--the president, academic dean, chief business officer, and others.

The successful launching and execution of any of these suggestions (or others that they in turn suggest) is dependent upon leadership from a person or group of people interested in their development and execution. The professional organizations in the respective fields of specialization constitute one such possibility. Another is one or more individual institutional officers who are willing to devote the time and energy to the organization of a consortia of his peers. A third possibility is a university with a program related to the field of specialization and a willingness to undertake leadership in the development of such a consortia. Also necessary, if the program is to be developed in a number of localities and fields of specialization simultaneously and reasonably quickly is an open indication of interest in this type of development from the staff and Advisory Council of the Division of College Support.

Development of Staff Functions

Administration in a small college is apt to be dependent upon individuals and conceived of in terms of individuals, whereas administration in a larger institution is conceived of and carried out in terms of functions. The operation of a modern college--even a small one--is too complex to be handled on a familial basis, and therefore a vital element in the modernization of a small college is the "professionalization" of the staff, i.e., the shift from dependence upon individuals to dependence upon functions effectively performed by individuals who may change from time to time without the institution collapsing as a result of the change. Ironically, the "functionalization" of the small college usually is heavily dependent upon the leadership and effectiveness of individuals. Under the leadership of one or several charismatic and energetic individuals, the institution makes the transition to professionalization and differentiation of the functions which need to be performed to keep it in operation.

In many small colleges the president would do well to conceive of his job--insofar as it is not one of concern with the immediate survival of the institution--as a "building process" in which he develops a degree of professionalization in each of the major administrative service areas within the college. He may do this selectively, concentrating on one, two, or three service areas at a time.

It is unlikely that he can deal with all of them at once. The attention which he himself can give to this activity is necessarily limited, the financial investment which he can make in new personnel, new equipment, and the necessary travel, etc. necessary to professionalize each area also is limited, and the occupancy of some positions by ineffective incumbents who cannot be moved because of seniority, etc., also is a limiting factor. A similar process of "building" takes place in the development of the academic program and it too operates under similar constraints. If the president is lucky, he has a dean who can give full attention to academic building while the president divides his attention between academic building and administrative building. In many cases, however, the president must give attention to both.

Elements in the professionalization of any particular administrative activity typically include the following:

1. A survey--formal or informal--of the extent and nature of the present operation and the extent and nature of comparable activities in well-administered institutions of a similar size and type.

2. Securing leadership for the functional area. The present incumbent may be suitable or it may be necessary to bring in a new individual. Qualities necessary for such leadership typically include a willingness to work hard, a willingness to change existing procedures, a degree of imagination, a degree of realism in terms of judging the applicability of models from other institutions to the needs and capabilities of one's own institution, and an ability to work with people within the office itself, people in other administrative capacities, and people on the faculty. Developing institutions typically have limited salary levels and for this and other reasons they are limited in their ability to recruit successful and established professionals. Therefore, although they should not give up efforts to recruit experienced professionals, they must face the fact that in

many instances they will need to settle for the recruitment of a person with potential and then provide financial support and encouragement for that individual's self-education and professional growth.

3. The constant encouragement of the president and other key officers is vitally important in this process. Also crucial is the availability of money for professional memberships in relevant organizations, travel to national meetings, travel to visit other institutions to study practices and procedures, and money for the purchase on a continuing basis of a professional library and subscriptions to appropriate journals. When the revamping of the existing operation necessitates the expenditure of money for additional staff, equipment, etc., this too must be provided, although it can be on a "phased" basis which enables the administrator to plan his expansion and modernization over a period of years but gives notice to him that the total plan for modernization will be supported by the institution. This is important for morale and stimulates his own continuing self-education.

Some type of training program in which the individual administrator can take part is of major assistance in this kind of building program. These are especially helpful if they are operated on a continuing basis so that participation is not simply a matter of attendance at a summer institute but involves a continuing relationship throughout the year with workshops or institutes, exchange of materials and the availability of expert consultant assistance.

Some of the professional organizations for specialists within higher education administration provide training programs. Programs that directly relate to small and/or developing institutions such as the CCDP program are particularly promising because of their specific relevance. The availability of outside expert help via these programs is of extreme importance. Given enthusiasm and willingness to work within the institution, the availability of outside expert assistance goes far toward insuring that the program developed within the institution follows the best available techniques. In the absence of genuine commitment within the institution, however, it is unlikely that outside expert consultative assistance can make any major changes in institutional performance.

Retention of Staff Within Institutions

A number of the institutions we visited, despite weaknesses, had a spark--or a number of sparks--of vitality, energy, determination, and ambition. Federal assistance through the Title III program seemed to play a significant role--sometimes out of all proportion to the amount of money invested--in fanning these sparks. By so doing it helped give to these campuses a greater sense of excitement and enthusiasm that helped them to hold capable and imaginative administrators and faculty in the face of offers to go elsewhere. Such people aren't plentiful in any institution and especially not in developing institutions. Their retention is of critical importance to these institutions.

The satisfactions of teaching or administration in a small college have always contained a certain degree of the "big fish in a little pond" syndrome. Although folklore is critical of the man who is satisfied to be a big fish in a little pond, many of the lost aspects of education which we bemoan such as intimate contact between students and faculty are almost by definition "little pond" phenomena. Society pays special honor to the Albert Sweitzers and the George Washington Carvers because they stuck with little ponds when they could have succeeded in big ones. We do not claim to have interviewed any Sweitzers, but we did meet many people who were in small and struggling institutions by choice and not out of necessity. One of the things which gave encouragement to these people--often to the point of making the difference of staying or leaving--was the symbolic as well as material support represented by outside assistance such as that made available under the Developing Institutions Program. In some cases it made the difference in a very direct way--it paid their salaries--but equally often the individual's salary was paid by the institution and Title III funds paid for activities which were sufficiently imaginative, innovative, or important to encourage individuals to stay. Furthermore, in a period of financial insecurity for marginal institutions, the presence of this outside assistance was tangible evidence that the institutions were not altogether forgotten, and that there might still be hope for the future. The sources of long-term future funding might not be clear (usually they were not) but there was hope that that problem would work itself out since the wherewithal for a degree of immediate financial stability had been found.

This latter, of course, raises the issue of whether some of these institutions will be "saved" in the long run only by permanent Federal assistance. Without doubt that will be the case for some of these institutions, just as it is also the case for large numbers of other institutions not funded under the Developing Institutions Act. For this subgroup of institutions within the Developing Institutions group then, it seems fair to conclude that if they qualify for Developing Institutions assistance on other groups (i.e., by being in the "developing" category), they should not be disqualified on the grounds that their long-term survival will depend upon the same form of future general support from Federal sources which also will save other institutions now a step or two better off.

CHAPTER VI

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRES

In an attempt to gather some systematic quantitative data to buttress the material obtained in the somewhat unstructured intensive interviews, the study design provided for questionnaires to be administered to the faculty and administrators at the institutions included in the study. Since this was a secondary source of data, and we were concerned about obtaining an adequate response rate from an overburdened staff, the questionnaires were brief. We were mainly interested in getting some basic data--on contact, impact and feelings about the Title III programs--from the total body of faculty and administrators, to enable us to place in perspective the information we received from the more specialized and unsystematic samples that we interviewed in our campus visits.

We had hoped to administer the questionnaires at all the schools, but in a number of institutions this was not possible because our campus visits came during final examinations or even after the conclusion of the school year. Thus, the questionnaires were obtained at 21 of the 37 institutions in the study. At 15 institutions, the total population of faculty and administration was included in the sample. In the other six institutions where the total faculty numbered several hundred, random samples of approximately 100 were contacted for questionnaires.

Programs at predominantly Negro colleges are very well covered in this data; questionnaire responses were received from faculty members and administrators at 15 of the 16 predominantly Negro colleges in our sample. Questionnaires were also distributed at one predominantly white college campus in the south and at five predominantly white college campuses in a midwest consortium.

The questionnaires were addressed to each person in the sample and sent to their campus address by the interview teams at the time of the institutional visit. A return envelope addressed to the University of Michigan was enclosed, guaranteeing the respondent confidentiality.

A return rate of 36 percent was obtained from the spring administration. In order to raise the return rate, questionnaires were sent out at the beginning of September to all faculty and administrators who had not responded. Thirty-three percent of these questionnaires were completed and returned, raising the return rate to 57 percent of the total number of persons in the sample. By institution, total return rate for the 21 colleges and universities ranged from 30 percent to 81 percent, with 50 percent or more questionnaires returned from 13 campuses. Although this probably represents an underestimate of the return rate,[1] it does suggest that our returns represent some bias in the direction of administrators and faculty somewhat more interested in Title III programs, although less biased than our interview sample which purposively selected those most involved and knowledgeable.

---

[1] Questionnaires were sent to all faculty and administrators on personnel rosters provided by the institutions. These included those who were terminating their connection with the institution at the time of our study as well as those with minimal part-time commitments. A number of unanswered questionnaires were returned because the people to whom they were addressed had left the college. If these people had been eliminated from the sample, our return rate would have been higher.

Content of the Questionnaires

The questionnaire distributed to each person at a given institution listed the Title III programs in operation at that particular college and asked a series of questions about them: how important they were, how helpful to the college, how much contact the individual had had with them, how important he felt they were in contrast to other programs at the college supported by other (not Title III) sources. In addition, there were some general questions about Title III--mainly the individual's overall feelings about the program, and whether he felt there were important institutional needs not covered by Title III. Although the first page of each questionnaire was different for each institution, listing the programs at that particular institution, the same series of questions about these programs was asked at all the institutions. Finally, because bilateral relationships (between a "developing" and "developed" institution) have been so important in the history of Title III, the questionnaires for all institutions involved in such a relationship included a question asking the faculty and administrators for their feelings about that relationship and the reasons for their reactions.

Specifically, the questionnaires, and the data we will discuss, are addressed to the following set of questions:

1. How *important* are the different Title III programs, as seen by the faculty and administrators? To what extent are they seen as addressing the critical needs of the institution?

2. How *helpful* do faculty and administrators feel the different Title III programs have been to the institution?

3. What is the *impact* of the different programs, the extent of their influence throughout the institution (again, as perceived by faculty and administrators)?

4. What are some of the factors related to a faculty member or administrator's feelings about the different Title III programs? Specifically, to what extent are his feelings related to his *involvement in the program*, the "*quality*" or resources of his institution, and the extent of the *financial investment* by Title III in the program?

5. What are the reactions to bilateral relationships? What are some of the factors related to these reactions?

While the responses to these questions represent useful data, it is important to stress that they are limited. The feelings of an institution's staff about a program represent significant data in any attempt to evaluate the program's effect on that institution, since these feelings are in a

---

We would also have obtained a higher return rate by distributing questionnaires at faculty meetings. However, we wished to avoid the implicit coercion represented in such a method, as well as the constraints on openness of response that it might have introduced.

sense one aspect of such effects. However, they represent only part of the picture. For example, the feelings about a program's impact and effect is not a substitute for objective evaluations of this impact. In our discussion of the data, therefore, we will attempt to remain sensitive to these limitations, indicating what issues we feel the data do help illuminate, and what questions we feel they do not answer.

Importance of Title III Programs

Given the many needs and aspirations of the institutions that Title III is attempting to help, one significant question is the extent to which the people at the institutions feel that Title III programs are addressing their important needs. The first question in the questionnaire was directed to this issue. The faculty and administrators were asked to rate each of the Title III programs on the following scale:

Very important--directed to the most important needs.

Important--directed to important needs but others are just as important.

Fairly important--directed to important needs but others are more important.

Not important--not directed to important needs.

No opinion--don't really know enough about this program.

Table 7 presents the responses to this question for the 17 different types of Title III programs that were funded in the institutions where we obtained the questionnaires. Since the institutions we studied were not a random sample of all Title III supported institutions, this and the remaining tables must be interpreted with caution. The feelings about the National Teaching Fellows, for example, are not necessarily those we would have obtained if we had sampled all institutions with NTF's. This caution is particularly relevant for those programs that appeared in only one or two of the institutions that we studied. The figures represent only rough approximations of what we might have found in a random sampling of Title III institutions. A major criterion, then, is that the figures should not be interpreted in any absolute sense--e.g., "forty-one percent of the staff in all institutions receiving National Teaching Fellow support, feel that this program is 'very important'". The tables should be viewed mainly for some of the striking differences they suggest among the different programs.

Even with these cautions, it is clear that the overwhelming response to the Title III programs is the feeling that these programs are addressing themselves to important needs. Less than ten percent of the people who answered felt that any one of these programs was "not important," and in almost all instances these responses were less than five percent. This does not mean that the respondents felt that Title III was addressing itself to all the important needs of the institution, or even that there were not some particularly crucial ones that Title III did not cover. In both the questionnaire and the interviews, many people mentioned some important institutional needs they felt Title III should cover or support more adequately. We have indicated in other parts of this report, what some of these were. But feelings that coverage is not complete does not detract from the fact that in general the staff of these

TABLE 7

Perception of Importance of Title III Programs

Title III Programs	Very Important	Important	Fairly Important	Not Important	No Opinion	Total	Number
Freshman Program I	46%	31	8	2	13	100%	203
Freshman Program II	61%	23	5	4	7	100%	155
Other remedial programs	41%	28	11	6	14	100%	113
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	28%	27	10	2	33	100%	235
Learning resources	32%	27	15	7	19	100%	106
Consortium programs	23%	44	21	3	9	100%	149
Faculty development and faculty exchange	45%	31	8	2	14	100%	389
Visiting Scholars	19%	38	21	4	18	100%	229
National Teaching Fellows	41%	26	9	2	22	100%	619
College Placement Services, Inc.	35%	23	12	0	30	100%	196
Student exchange	39%	33	15	5	8	100%	170
Cultural enrichment	32%	32	9	8	19	100%	73
Cooperative College Development Program	22%	18	8	0	52	100%	114
Self-study and planning programs	63%	18	9	7	3	100%	185

institutions believe that what Title III does support is important.

Within this generalization, however, it is also clear that some marked differentiations are made, that some programs are seen as more important than others. These responses in Table 7 might be viewed as indicating an order of priorities that the staff in these institutions might set for these programs. The programs that seem to be viewed as most important tend to be those in which Title III itself has concentrated most of its efforts and resources--the programs focusing on innovative, remedial approaches (Freshman Programs I and II[2] and other remedial programs) and those oriented toward faculty development and exchange (including the National Teaching Fellow program). Also strikingly high in importance are programs supporting self-study and planning which also have high priority in the thinking and planning behind the Title III program.[3]

Among the programs that are seen as less important in Table 7, two reasons seem associated with this lower significance. In some instances fewer people feel that the programs are very important because the programs are not very well known on the campus, as indicated by the large proportion indicating "no opinion" in response to the question. In other instances, the programs are well known, and the feeling that they are less important seems to reflect a lower priority for the program and its purposes among the faculty and administrators at the institution.

The Cooperative College Development Program is an example of a lower feeling of importance that seems to be very much tied to ignorance about the program and its purposes. Slightly over half of the people who completed the questionnaire in institutions that had such a program indicated "no opinion" about it. Our interviews also indicated that this program was of concern to only some people in the institution, particularly the top administrators mainly concerned about support for long-range development and planning. This is to be expected in a program of this type, and does not necessarily indicate any antagonism or questioning of the program.

The reaction to the consortium programs represents a different issue. Here we find that almost all people did have an opinion (less than ten percent indicated "no opinion" to the importance question). Therefore, the fact that fewer people felt the programs were "very important" seems to represent generally less enthusiasm for the program and its purposes, rather than ignorance of it or what it was doing.

---

[2] Freshman Programs I and II refer to the ISE and CEAP. We have avoided labelling them directly in the tables in order to discourage comparisons based on our inadequate sampling. Given the limited sampling, the 15 percent difference in the "very important" rating of Programs I and II could be misleading. The more significant finding is that both of these programs, together with the "other remedial programs" all get relatively high ratings of importance when compared with some of the others in Table 7.

[3] It should be noted, however, that "self-study and planning" is a very broad category including many different types of programs. We will note in our later discussion that feelings about importance vary considerably according to the type of "self-study and planning" program involved (see discussion around Table 19 below).

What is the significance of this more qualified expression of satisfaction? At this point it is important to stress again that these feelings of faculty and administrators are only part of the relevant data. The fact that the consortia programs are viewed as less important does not mean that an outside observer with more "objective" evaluative criteria would also rate them as less valuable than some of the programs that faculty and administrators saw as more important. But the responses do reflect the fact that there are some inevitable tensions produced in consortia between the need for some centralization of authority and planning, and the desire of the individual institutions for their own autonomy and control.[4] The lower enthusiasm for the consortia programs, then, may be taken not as indications that consortia are less valuable programs, but that they create some strain and negative reactions in the people at the individual institutions.

These negative reactions, it should be noted, can be critically important, for individual resistances can destroy the most potentially valuable program. In a sense, then, consortia face the dilemma of most innovative attempts that involve some infringement on existing institutional arrangements and control structures. Unless there are some indications of dissatisfaction and resistance, the innovative effects are probably of minimal scope and effectiveness; on the other hand, the innovations must also include mechanisms for handling the negativism and resistance.

The figures in Table 7 suggest that the Visiting Scholar program also is one where a less enthusiastic response is not a function of lack of knowledge about the program. The reactions to this program are particularly interesting when contrasted with the reactions to the National Teaching Fellows. The latter are seen as much more important; this difference also appeared clearly in our interviews at the institutions. The NTF's were seen as very useful, fulfilling a multiplicity of functions, whereas some serious question was expressed at the limitations of the Visiting Scholar program.

These findings on the comparison of reactions to Visiting Scholars and NTF's points up a possible conflict between the needs and desires of the institutions on the one hand, and the broader purposes of Title III on the other. A major value of the NTF's to the developing institutions has been the flexibility of the program. As indicated in our discussion of the NTF program, it has been used by the institution in many ways, very often for very limited "maintenance" purposes as well as for the broader function of breaking down isolation and encouraging innovation by bringing in "fresh blood" to the institution, or enabling existing faculty members to go outside for further study. In a number of institutions we found NTF's were indistinguishable from other faculty members; in such instances the program has essentially served the function of enabling the institutions to hire more faculty to help carry the teaching load. While of great value to the institution, such use of NTF's has not really contributed to the major innovative and broadening purposes underlying the Title III program.

---

[4] It should be noted, in this connection, that the responses to consortia in Table 7 came from people in institutions involved in a consortium that had an active coordinating administrative body with a good deal of control over planning and budgets. Responses to similar questions, asking for general reactions to the consortium arrangement, are not available from faculty members and administrators at the schools in the other two consortia investigated in this study.

In a sense, then, the Visiting Scholar program represents a purer application of the principle that Title III programs should be devoted toward broadening the experience of the faculty at the developing institutions. However, it is clear in the questionnaire responses, as well as in the interviews, that the Visiting Scholar program, though "purer", is not felt by the staff at these institutions to fulfill their needs as well as the NTF program. This reflects, then, the broader issue discussed elsewhere in this report, the tension between "maintenance" and "innovative" needs. Given the stark and overwhelming needs of many of these institutions at this time, we cannot always automatically assume that "maintenance" is an inappropriate use of Title III funds. As we indicate in our fuller discussion of these faculty programs, in this particular instance we would agree with the responses of the faculty and the administrators, that the Visiting Scholar program is of less value to the institution than the National Teaching Fellows.

Helpfulness of the Title III Programs

It is possible to think that a program is a very important one, that it addresses the significant needs of the institution, and still feel that it has not been very helpful, that it has not been successful in carrying out its purposes. In addition to the question on importance, therefore, the questionnaire asked the faculty and administrators to indicate how "helpful" they felt each of the Title III programs had been. They were asked to rate the helpfulness of each program on the following scale:

A very helpful program--many positive effects, hard to imagine the college without it.

A helpful program--a good program with many contributions to the life of the college.

Neutral--hardly know it's here, little or no impact on the college.

A negative program--has caused more trouble than help.

No opinion--don't know enough about this program.

Table 8 presents the faculty and administrator responses to this question. In general, the pattern of response and the differences among the programs follow those we have already noted in the responses to the questions on importance of the programs. Remedial, faculty and self-study programs are seen as particularly helpful; student programs (CPS and student exchange) are seen as somewhat less helpful to the institution. The consortia programs, Visiting Scholars, and CCDP again are seen as of the lowest usefulness (the last probably more out of ignorance of the program, than any clear questioning of its usefulness).

One further comment may be made on the comparison between Table 7 and Table 8. While the responses in both tables are predominantly positive, they are somewhat less so on the "helpful" question than they are on the question on importance. In all but one or two instances, less people feel that a program is "very helpful" than feel it is "very important." This suggests that, to some extent, programs in their actual operation do not completely fulfill their promise and expectations. However, even here it should be noted that outright negative responses are rare; in most cases only a few percent of the population felt that a program was actually negative in its effects, had "caused more

TABLE 8

Perception of Helpfulness of Title III Programs

Title III Programs	Very Helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Negative	No Opinion	Total	Number
Freshman Program I	31%	42	12	1	14	100%	203
Freshman Program II	38%	36	8	10	8	100%	155
Other remedial programs	24%	39	11	7	19	100%	112
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	12%	34	13	3	38	100%	232
Learning resources	21%	27	23	8	21	100%	108
Consortium programs	15%	50	23	1	11	100%	149
Faculty development and faculty exchange	30%	42	10	2	16	100%	387
Visiting Scholars	13%	47	16	4	20	100%	229
National Teaching Fellows	30%	34	11	2	23	100%	619
College Placement Services, Inc.	25%	33	6	1	35	100%	199
Student exchange	26%	41	17	5	11	100%	170
Cultural enrichment	23%	41	16	3	17	100%	73
Cooperative College Development Program	13%	24	13	0	50	100%	113
Self-study and planning programs	49%	27	12	8	4	100%	183

trouble than help." Even when we look at the much milder criticism that one "hardly knows it's here; little or no impact on the college," we find that decided minorities (ranging usually between 10 percent and 20 percent of the people answering the questionnaires) felt this way about a given program. In general, then, in this as in the preceding question, it is clear that the general response at these institutions to Title III programs and their operation is a predominantly favorable one.

We have already indicated that the responses of faculty, whether favorable or unfavorable, do not represent the complete evaluation of these programs. What these generally favorable responses do seem to represent, however, are two things which are certainly aspects of any overall evaluation. First of all, they seem to represent the general feeling that Title III is addressing significant needs of the institutions. Secondly, the generally favorable feelings seem to reflect an unusually smooth and friendly set of relationships between the developing institutions and the Washington representatives administering Title III. This was particularly apparent in the interviews, where the usual criticisms of Washington bureaucracy were minimal, and where it was clear that the people in the institutions felt that the representatives of Title III were interested in their needs and in helping them fulfill the program's objectives.

Impact of Title III Programs

Of critical concern to the whole Title III endeavor, is the impact of Title III on the total institution. In most of the programmatic concerns supported by Title III, the interest is not only on the effectiveness of the program itself, but on the extent to which it serves as an impetus for innovation and change thoughout the institution. In several questions of the questionnaire, therefore, we attempted to tap the breadth or narrowness of each program's impact.

Three different questions were asked in this area. First, we wanted information on the extent to which different people in the institution had some formal or informal relationship with a given program. The question was worded as follows: "What kind of contact have you had with each program?", and the following alternatives were offered:

Actively involved--I'm part of the program staff.

I'm not part of the program staff, but I have some interaction with the program in my official administrative or faculty position.

I have some informal contact with the program (informal consulting, exchange of ideas with those involved, etc.)

I have no contact with the program.

In a second question, regardless of the official relationship to the program, we were interested in the amount of contact each faculty member and administrator had with each Title III program. Thus, they were asked "How much contact have you had with each program?", with the following alternatives offered:

A great deal of contact.

A fair amount of contact.

A little contact.

None, although I know what the program is doing.

None, and I don't know anything about the program.

Finally, since contact and impact are not synonymous, we probed for impact directly by asking each respondent: "What effect has each of these programs had on your own work?", with the alternatives offered being "Major," "Some," "A Little," and "None".

Before discussing the responses to these questions it should be noted that data on amount of faculty and administrator contact with a program and the direct impact of the program on their work, have more implications for the issue of institutional impact for some programs than for others. The questionnaire data are particularly relevant for those programs where broad contact with faculty and other staff might be taken as a meaningful measure of program impact. This would obviously be true for those programs directly involving faculty, such as the faculty development and exchange program and the National Teaching Fellowships. It would also apply to the freshman and remedial programs which, in addition to their specific remedial functions, are hopefully directed toward introducing innovative teaching approaches throughout the institution. Broad faculty contact is less meaningful as a measure of institutional impact of some of the other programs. For example, the impact of the CCDP program will ultimately be measured by the broad institutional changes it institutes and the long-range effects these have on all the people within the institution, even though at the time of the questionnaire many of the faculty did not know what the program was or was trying to accomplish.

Granted the limitations in these data, particularly with respect to certain programs, the responses are still of interest. The first point to be noted about the responses to the three questions--on kind of contact, amount of contact, and effect of a program on one's work--is that they were very highly related to each other. The people who had some formal relationship with the program--were part of the program staff, or interacted with it as part of their administration or faculty responsibility--also had much more contact than those with an informal relationship to the program, and also much more often felt that the program had had an impact on their work. The results of these high interrelationships can be seen in Tables 9, 10 and 11 where we may note that the proportion of respondents who indicate some formal relationship to a given program ("staff" or "official" contact in Table 9) is about the same as the proportion who indicate a "great deal" or "fair" amount of contact (Table 10) and who feel that the program has had a "major" or "some" effect on their work (Table 11).

That these three questions are highly related is, of course, not surprising. The point is stressed here because there has been a tendency in organizational studies to minimize the significance of formal structure and relationships, and to suggest that it is the informal communication and influence processes that are "really" significant. It is important, therefore, to indicate that at least in studying the spread and influence of Title III

TABLE 9

Kind of Contact with Title III Programs

Title III Programs	Staff	Official	Informal	None	Total	Number
Freshman Program I	7%	16	43	34	100%	201
Freshman Program II	15%	29	33	23	100%	154
Other remedial programs	7%	19	40	34	100%	113
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	7%	12	25	56	100%	231
Learning resources	7%	14	37	42	100%	105
Consortium programs	7%	33	40	20	100%	150
Faculty development and faculty exchange	5%	23	32	40	100%	384
Visiting Scholars	4%	15	37	44	100%	224
National Teaching Fellows	9%	15	27	49	100%	613
College Placement Services, Inc.	2%	15	28	55	100%	194
Student exchange	2%	20	40	38	100%	169
Cultural enrichment	9%	16	39	36	100%	71
Cooperative College Development Program	5%	13	16	66	100%	111
Self-study and planning programs	11%	43	30	16	100%	185

TABLE 10

Amount of Contact with Title III Programs

Title III Programs	Great deal	Fair	Little	None, but know program	None	Total	Number
Freshman Program I	12%	17	30	27	14	100%	201
Freshman Program II	24%	29	20	17	10	100%	156
Other remedial programs	14%	15	29	21	21	100%	115
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	8%	12	14	29	37	100%	231
Learning resources	11%	16	26	29	18	100%	108
Consortium programs	9%	26	37	19	9	100%	150
Faculty development and faculty exchange	11%	20	24	25	20	100%	384
Visiting Scholars	7%	18	26	27	22	100%	228
National Teaching Fellows	12%	14	17	26	31	100%	615
College Placement Services, Inc.	7%	19	16	25	33	100%	195
Student exchange	9%	15	27	32	17	100%	167
Cultural enrichment	10%	19	22	32	17	100%	72
Cooperative College Development Program	4%	8	14	23	51	100%	110
Self-study and planning programs	27%	35	18	15	5	100%	185

TABLE 11

Impact of Title III Programs on Individual's Work

Title III Programs	Major	Some	Little	None	Total	Number
Freshman Program I	13%	22	22	43	100%	114
Freshman Program II	27%	26	10	37	100%	96
Other remedial programs	16%	20	22	42	100%	69
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	8%	17	15	60	100%	133
Learning resources	11%	16	18	55	100%	75
Consortium programs	6%	38	24	32	100%	114
Faculty development and faculty exchange	13%	20	13	54	100%	232
Visiting Scholars	6%	20	20	54	100%	136
National Teaching Fellows	12%	16	14	58	100%	400
College Placement Services, Inc.	6%	23	20	51	100%	100
Student exchange	4%	18	21	57	100%	94
Cultural enrichment	6%	27	21	46	100%	48
Cooperative College Development Program	4%	15	9	72	100%	67
Self-study and planning programs	36%	30	13	21	100%	135

programs, the greatest impact occurs on those people who have been involved in the programs in some formal sense. It might be noted, incidentally, that this tendency for impact to be confined mainly to those formally involved in a program, conform to the impressions we gained in our interviews, which suggested a certain amount of "encapsulation" in many of these programs. In general, programs tended to focus on their internal efficiency and success, without much concern about transmitting the program experience to people not involved in the programs.

It is probably particularly important to stress this rather obvious point in a discussion of Title III and its impact on the institutions it serves. Since Title III is devoted to a total institutional effect, those concerned with its operation tend to focus on the issue of institution-wide impact. To some extent this may place an undue burden on Title III programs. We may be expecting too broad an effect, and it may be more appropriate to judge the programs by more limited standards. This is especially true at this time, in the early years of the Title III programs. These programs are still in their infancy, and one or two years is too short a time to expect them to have broad ramifications thoughout the institution.

With these general comments as background, we can examine the data in Tables 9, 10 and 11 for what they suggest about the relative impact and influence of the different Title III programs. It is of interest in this connection to compare the variations among programs in Tables 9 to 11 with the variation that was observed in the responses on the importance and the helpfulness of these programs in Tables 7 and 8. In general, if we look at the figures for those people who felt a noticeable impact from the programs--that is, those who are formally a part of the program (Table 9) or who said they had a "fair" or "great deal" of contact with the program (Table 10) or who felt it had "some" or a "major" effect on their work (Table 11)--there seems to be less variation among the different programs than there was in the proportions of people who felt that the programs were "very important" (Table 7) or "very helpful" (Table 8). For example, if we look in Table 9 at the amount of contact with the different programs and add those who said they had a "fair" and a "great deal" of contact, we find that in 11 of the 14 programs, responses range between 24 and 35 percent. Only three of the programs fall outside this rather narrow range. In two of these, the self-study and planning programs and one of the innovative freshman programs, an unusually large proportion of people have a considerable contact with them. In the third case, the CCDP, an unusually low proportion of people had meaningful contact with the program.

It is interesting that in all three of these exceptions, the amount of contact is consistent with the feelings about importance and helpfulness. Self-study and planning programs and Freshman Program II which have widespread contact throughout the institutions were also programs seen as unusually useful and important (see Tables 7 and 8).[5] In a sense, the contact explains the feelings of importance--when programs actively involve a major portion of faculty and administrators they are likely to be viewed as important and useful. Conversely, when, as in the case of the CCDP, very few people have active contact with the program, not many see it as very important or useful--most of them have "no opinion" on these questions (Tables 7 and 8).

---

[5] It should be noted that this does not mean that Freshman Program II is "better" than Freshman Program I. The differences between the two programs that appear in Tables 7 through 11 seem to reflect the fact that while both programs are coordinated by outside agencies, the agency exerts more control over Program I than over Program II. Thus Program II seems to get a greater and broader involvement within the institution than does Program I. What are reflected in Tables 7 through 11 are some of the benefits of this greater involvement--namely, that more people have contact with the program and feel

In these three cases of extremely high or low contact, then, the feeling about the importance and helpfulness of the program is consistent with the degree of one's ontact with it. For the other programs, however, the large variation in their perceptions of importance and helpfulness that we noted in Tables 7 and 8, occurred in spite of the fact that degree of contact is fairly equivalent across the different programs. Since, as we will later see, there is in general a very large relationship between involvement in a program and feelings about its importance and usefulness, the figures in Table 7 and 8 to some extent indicate the extent to which a program is seen as important and useful even among the people who are less involved in it. Thus, for example, remedial programs and National Teaching Fellows tend to be seen as "very important" by more faculty and administrators in an institution than see the Visiting Scholars or other programs as important, even though the actual involvement in these programs is fairly similar. This tends to underscore the importance of the NTF's and remedial programs in the eyes of the people in these institutions. These programs seem to have an institution-wide commitment that extends beyond the boundaries of those actually involved in them.

Factors Related to Feelings About Title III Programs

We have already suggested the relationship between involvement in a program and one's feelings about it. In this section we will look at this relationship more specifically by relating the individual's ratings of importance and helpfulness to his formal involvement in a program.

In this section we will also examine the relationship between attitudes toward a program and other factors. A particular concern in the administration of Title III programs has been the attempt to arrive at some indices of the "quality" of an institution, the institution's resources and capacities to utilize the Title III programs effectively. We will, therefore, examine the relationship between our questionnaire responses and a measure of the resources or "quality" of the institution. While this in no way provides a definitive answer to the question of institutional quality and program effectiveness, it will hopefully add some perspective to this issue.

Another issue of obvious interest is the relationship between the effect of a program and the financial resources that go into the program. We will, therefore, present the data on the relationship between program financing and feelings about it.

Finally, since the different Title III programs are differentially related to teaching and administrative needs, we will look at the relationship between one's role in the institution and one's feelings about the different programs.

---

positively about it. What is not reflected in these tables, however, are some of the corollary advantages of Program I. The greater outside coordinative control in Program I has meant a program with clearer direction and planning.

Involvement in the Program

Tables 12, 13, and 14 present the relationship between the staff member's formal involvement in the program and his feelings about it. Table 12 indicates the extent to which individuals form opinions about a program even when they have no contact with it. We have taken as a measure of the readiness to form opinions on an issue, the proportion who indicated "no opinion" in answering the question about the importance of the different programs. As indicated in Table 12, with a few exceptions, people who have any contact with the program, informal as well as formal, do tend to give an opinion about its importance. Among those who have had no contact with the program, however, there is a great variety in the responses to the different programs, ranging from the 14 percent who have "no opinion" on the self-study and planning programs to the 66 percent who have "no opinion" about the CCDP.

These figures give some picture of the extent to which the knowledge about a given program spreads across a campus regardless of one's actual contact with or involvement in it. Thus, the wide knowledge of the self-study and planning programs that we noted in our previous discussion is evident not only in the large proportion of people who had actual contact with it, but also in the fact that even among the relatively few who had no contact, most were ready to give some opinion about its importance.

The readiness of people to give an opinion about the importance of a program even when they have no contact with it does not necessarily mean that they have any real knowledge about the specific operation of the program on the campus. For example, the fact that most people who have had no contact with student exchange programs still are ready to volunteer an opinion about their importance, may reflect the fact that the student exchange notion is a very obvious one, and one can have an opinion about the importance of the concept of the program without any knowledge of its operation on one's campus.

Because of the great inter-program variation in the numbers who had "no opinion" on the importance and helpfulness questions, we felt it would be more meaningful to look at the relationship between involvement and the perception of program importance and helpfulness in Tables 13 and 14, by figuring percentages only on those people who had offered opinions in responding to these questions. When this is done, it is very clear that we find the expected relationship between involvement in the program and the feeling that it is "very important" and "very helpful"--those faculty and administrators officially involved in a program tend to be much more supportive of it than those with informal or no involvement.

What is interesting in Table 13 and 14, therefore, are those instances where we do not get a striking relationship with involvement, where people officially connected with a program do not express unusual support for it. In a sense, the feelings expressed by those officially involved in a program may be more significant data than the feelings of the total population that we examined in Tables 7 and 8. Given the general tendency for those formally involved to feel that the programs are "very important" and "very helpful," the instances where this does not occur may be viewed as particularly symptomatic. Three programs stand out in Tables 13 and 14 in the limited degree of support accorded by those officially connected with them--Visiting Scholars, student exchange and the consortia. In the former two cases these

TABLE 12

Relationship between Involvement in Program and Having "No Opinion" on Importance of Program

Title III Programs	Staff	Official	Informal	None
Freshman Program I	0% (14)[*]	0% (32)	3% (87)	34% (67)
Freshman Program II	0% (23)	2% (45)	2% (51)	24% (34)
Other remedial programs	--[**]	0% (21)	4% (45)	37% (38)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	0% (15)	0% (27)	5% (58)	55% (130)
Learning resources	--	0% (15)	0% (37)	46% (44)
Consortium programs	10% (10)	2% (50)	5% (59)	27% (30)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	0% (20)	3% (89)	2% (119)	31% (153)
Visiting Scholars	--	0% (33)	2% (84)	37% (98)
National Teaching Fellows	6% (52)	1% (90)	5% (166)	40% (300)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	3% (30)	4% (53)	51% (105)
Student exchange	--	0% (34)	2% (68)	19% (64)
Cultural enrichment	--	0% (11)	0% (28)	54% (26)
Cooperative College Development Program	--	21% (14)	18% (17)	66% (73)
Self-study and planning programs	5% (20)	0% (80)	0% (56)	14% (29)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

TABLE 13

Relationship between Involvement in Program and Feeling that Program is "Very Important"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Staff	Official	Informal	None
Freshman Program I	79% (14)[*]	59% (32)	58% (84)	32% (44)
Freshman Program II	78% (23)	75% (44)	58% (50)	54% (26)
Other remedial programs	--[**]	52% (21)	44% (43)	50% (24)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	73% (15)	56% (27)	33% (55)	36% (58)
Learning resources	--	73% (15)	41% (37)	13% (24)
Consortium programs	--	39% (49)	14% (56)	23% (22)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	60% (20)	52% (86)	56% (117)	48% (106)
Visiting Scholars	--	33% (33)	18% (82)	21% (62)
National Teaching Fellows	69% (49)	63% (89)	52% (157)	44% (181)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	55% (29)	45% (51)	52% (52)
Student exchange	--	35% (34)	48% (67)	39% (52)
Cultural enrichment	--	46% (11)	32% (28)	42% (12)
Cooperative College Development Program	--	64% (11)	57% (14)	28% (25)
Self-study and planning programs	95% (19)	71% (80)	54% (56)	48% (25)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

TABLE 14

Relationship between Involvement in Program and Feeling that Program is "Very Helpful"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Staff	Official	Informal	None
Freshman Program I	50% (14)[*]	56% (32)	35% (83)	19% (43)
Freshman Program II	48% (23)	49% (43)	36% (50)	29% (24)
Other remedial programs	--[**]	52% (21)	31% (39)	9% (22)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	29% (14)	31% (26)	21% (52)	10% (50)
Learning resources	--	50% (14)	24% (37)	4% (23)
Consortium programs	--	33% (49)	4% (53)	19% (21)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	58% (19)	44% (86)	35% (116)	22% (95)
Visiting Scholars	--	24% (33)	14% (80)	9% (57)
National Teaching Fellows	60% (50)	56% (88)	38% (156)	25% (171)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	52% (29)	42% (50)	26% (46)
Student exchange	--	29% (31)	30% (67)	27% (49)
Cultural enrichment	--	36% (11)	22% (27)	7% (15)
Cooperative College Development Program	--	50% (10)	24% (17)	13% (24)
Self-study and planning programs	80% (19)	64% (80)	35% (52)	24% (25)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

responses seem to relect the limited nature of these programs and what, from our interviews, seemed to be their very limited impact. In the case of the consortia the problem seems to have been not so much any insignificance of the program, as the tension it created around issues of autonomy and independence of the individual cooperating institutions.

"Quality" of the Institution

Since the decisions involved in allocating Title III funds relate not only to the question of what programs to support, but, perhaps more importantly, which institutions to support, some attempt was made to relate our questionnaire responses to some index of the "quality" of the institution. We were not clear what relationships to expect. In a sense, two contradictory tendencies may be operating here. The poorer the quality of the institution, the less its resources, the more important and significant Title III programs might be for it. On the other hand, the higher the quality, the more effectively one might expect the institution to use Title III funds. Our brief investigation of this area, therefore, should be viewed as exploratory.

The "quality" rating used in the following tables is intended only as a rough comparison among institutions in our sample, and does not imply any rating of institutions against absolute criteria of quality, or a "quality" rating in relation to all Title III institutions or colleges and universities in general. Variables included in the rating are faculty-student ratio, percentage of faculty with doctorates, education and general expense per student, number of library volumes per student, and average test scores (CEEB or ACT) of entering freshmen. In each case the data were taken from documents supplied by the institution as part of a Title III application; most figures represent status as of fall 1968. The 37 colleges and universities in our sample were divided into approximately equal groups on each variable, the relative standing of each institution was summed across variables, and the list of institutions, rank-ordered according to total score, was divided into five equal categories or "quality" ratings, with one as low and five as high.

Obviously, this procedure makes no final judgment about the meaning of "quality," but simply attempts to order the institutions in our sample according to some of the dimensions often used in higher education research. When we look at individual institutions we find that those with a "quality" rating of four or five have more faculty with doctorates, a lower student-faculty ration, more library books per student, spend more in education and general expense per student, and enter students with higher test scores than is true for the institutions with a "quality" rating of one or two. (Institutions with a "quality" rating of three have overlap with both groups on specific variables.) The ratings are not intended to imply any judgement beyond this rough rank-ordering.

Table 15 presents the relationship between the institutional quality rating and the proportion of people who had formal contact with each of the programs (i.e., were on the program staff or interacted with it as part of their administrative or faculty responsibility). We expected that since institutions of lower quality tended to be poorer and perhaps more dependent on Title III funds, there might be greater involvement in the programs. However, Table 15 indicates no clear relationship between quality and involvement.

TABLE 15

Relationship between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Formal Contact with Program

Title III Programs	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Freshman Program I	26% (57)[*]	23% (78)	20% (66)		
Freshman Program II	50% (46)	33% (57)		51% (51)	
Other remedial programs	31% (81)		16% (32)		
Curriculum development in specific disciplines		32% (71)	11% (142)		
Learning resources		30% (40)		10% (48)	
Consortium programs				48% (108)	21% (42)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	30% (78)	34% (89)	21% (110)	15% (47)	43% (42)
Visiting Scholars	32% (19)		15% (98)	9% (47)	33% (42)
National Teaching Fellows	26% (77)	31% (127)	16% (142)	18% (154)	31% (98)
Student exchange	28% (57)		19% (112)		
Cooperative College Development Program		15% (55)			21% (56)
Self-study and planning programs			18% (33)	60% (110)	67% (42)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

In a similar vein, we also expected that there might be more widespread knowledge of Title III programs among the institutions of lower "quality." However, Table 16 does not indicate any such relationship, using the "no opinion" response on the importance question as an index of lack of awareness of a program.

Table 17 relates quality rating of an institution to the feeling that a program is "very helpful." Usually the respondents in any given cell of the table represent perceptions of a program at one or two institutions. This makes it difficult to make many generalizations about these proportions, since no doubt there are many chracteristics in addition to the "quality" rating of the institution which enter into the view of a program's "helpfulness." It is interesting to note, however, that programs tend to cluster at levels of institutions; most of the curriculum development and remedial programs are at institutions in the first three categories, and programs to assist student services also tend to concentrate in the lower quality schools. (Two student service programs are not included in Table 17--two institutions with funds for student cultural enrichment are both in quality level 2, three institutions with funds for College Placement Services are all in quality level 3.) The consortium programs, self-study and planning, and Visiting Scholar programs are concentrated at institutions in the top three categories. The only two programs which cut across all five levels of quality are Faculty Development and Exchange and National Teaching Fellows. Program grants to some extent seem to reflect an underlying assumption that some programs are more appropriate at certain quality levels.

Within the curriculum development and remedial programs, concentrated in the lower "quality" institutions, there is some indication that the lower the quality level the higher the proportion of respondents who feel that the program is "very helpful." Table 17 indicates that more than half the respondents at level 1 institutions feel Freshman Program I and Freshman Program II are "very helpful"; fewer than a quarter of the respondents at a level 4 institution find Freshman Program II "very helpful." More level 1 than level 3 respondents find other remedial programs to be "very helpful." More level 2 than level 4 respondents feel Learning Resources programs are "very helpful."

It seems reasonable to interpret these responses as reflecting the basic maintenance needs of lower "quality" level institutions, as part of or in addition to the specific value of the program in question. Institutions with higher "quality" characteristics would be expected to have access to more financial and talent resources and, therefore, less dependent on specific Title III assistance and more able to criticize programs it supports. Moreover, it is not surprising that the lowest quality institutions are particularly supportive of remedial programs, for these are seen as basic to their institution's needs.[6]

---

[6] The only other program where the lowest quality institution was more supportive of the program than the higher institutions was the Visiting Scholar Program. But here the evaluations of the lowest group are based on only 14 people in one institution. Many of the people in that institution checked "no opinion" on the helpfulness question; they actually gave the more appropriate response since our interviews indicate that the institution did not use the Title III funds for visiting scholars, since there simply were not the mechanics to take advantage of the grant.

TABLE 16

Relationship between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feeling of "No Opinion" on Importance of Program

Title III Programs	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Freshman Program I	12% (58)*	19% (78)	8% (67)		
Freshman Program II	11% (46)	7% (57)		4% (52)	
Other remedial programs	12% (81)		19% (32)		
Curriculum development in specific disciplines		23% (73)	38% (144)		
Learning resources		8% (40)		33% (48)	
Consortium programs				1% (108)	29% (41)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	11% (79)	20% (89)	12% (111)	24% (50)	2% (42)
Visiting Scholars	20% (20)		11% (100)	51% (49)	2% (42)
National Teaching Fellows	21% (78)	26% (129)	28% (141)	19% (156)	8% (99)
Student exchange	5% (58)		9% (112)		
Cooperative College Development Program		57% (56)			47% (58)
Self-study and planning programs			6% (33)	2% (110)	2% (42)

---

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

TABLE 17

Relationship between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feeling that Program is "Very Helpful"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Freshman Program I	53% (49)*	20% (65)	40% (60)		
Freshman Program II	63% (41)	42% (53)		23% (48)	
Other remedial programs	36% (66)		12% (25)		
Curriculum development in specific disciplines		19% (52)	22% (79)		
Learning resources		34% (35)		18% (34)	
Consortium programs				22% (104)	0% (28)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	38% (71)	37% (70)	39% (94)	33% (30)	20% (41)
Visiting Scholars	43% (14)		16% (86)	21% (24)	12% (42)
National Teaching Fellows	46% (63)	42% (94)	26% (99)	37% (120)	51% (90)
Student exchange	20% (54)		34% (98)		
Cooperative College Development Program		25% (24)			27% (33)
Self-study and planning programs			29% (28)	53% (107)	61% (41)

---

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

Most of the other programs showed no relationship with quality.[7] One of particular interest was the National Teaching Fellows program, for we might have expected the poorest institutions to have felt particularly dependent on this program. However, as Table 17 indicates, there is no clear relationship between quality level and the feeling that the NTF's were very helpful to the institution. This lack of relationship reflects the fact that objectively there does not seem to be any relationship between quality level of an institution and the number of NTF's awarded, and no strong relationship between quality level and primary use of NTF's for general institutional maintenance rather than to release regular faculty members or develop innovative programs. Two of the three institutions at level 1 use NTF's primarily for maintenance; three of four institutions at level 5 use NTF's primarily to release regular faculty; both patterns are found in institutions at the other three levels.

In summary, our findings tend to be inconclusive, but the relationships we did obtain point up the dilemma for those administering Title III funds, when they make their decisions about which institutions to support. Institutions with greater resources are liable to have greater administrative capability to make effective use of the funds. But poorer institutions have greater need for Title III funds and hence Title III support may often be more critical for them and of greater relative value and impact.

Financial Level of Program

One would expect that an obvious determinant of reactions to a program would be the level at which the program was funded. We expected that programs with greater funding would be more widely known in the institution, and seen as more beneficial and helpful.

Table 18 presents the relationship between the financial level of the program and the proportion of respondents who had "no opinion" on the importance of the program. If we take the "no opinion" response as an indication of lack of knowledge of the program, we see in Table 18 that there is some tendency for ignorance to be greatest when the program is minimally funded. But this tendency is much less than expected and occurs in only three of the programs--Visiting Scholars, learning resources, and National Teaching Fellows. The differences in extent of knowledge of a program are much greater between programs at any given level of funding, than they are between funding levels within any program. The nature of the program seems more important than its "size" in determining the extent to which people at the institution will feel they know enough about it to venture an opinion about its significance.

---

[7] Two programs suggested a possible direct relationship with quality--i.e., the higher the quality of the institution, the more helpful the program was perceived. One of these, the self-study and planning programs, really refers to very different types of programs, as will be discussed in the section on program financial support below, and the relationship with quality is probably incidental and irrelevant. The other, the student exchange programs, may also represent a chance finding, although the relationship with quality may suggest that this program is seen as somewhat of a luxury and irrelevant to their basic needs by the poorer institutions.

TABLE 18

Relationship between Financial Level of Program and Feeling of "No Opinion" on Importance of Program

Title III Programs	Less than $10,000	$10,000-19,999	$20,000-34,999	$35,000-49,999	$50,000-69,999	$70,000-99,999	$100,000-149,999	$150,000 or more
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	36% (44)[*]			3% (32)	35% (17)			
Learning resources		33% (48)						7% (39)
Faculty development and faculty exchange		20% (20)	17% (126)	8% (59)	18% (124)			
Visiting Scholars	51% (49)			20% (20)			11% (100)	
National Teaching Fellows	40% (40)		23% (222)	17% (181)	25% (32)	18% (56)		
College Placement Services, Inc.	25% (97)		35% (99)					
Self-study and planning programs	6% (32)	2% (42)			0% (73)			

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

There is also less relationship than one might have expected between the amount of financial support for a program and how helpful the people answering the questionnaires felt that the program had been to the institution. Table 19 indicates that the more amply funded program is seen as more helpful in three of the programs--learning resources, National Teaching Fellows, and self-study and planning programs. But only in the last instance is the relationship a clear one; and no relationship at all appears between financial level and perceived helpfulness of the other programs.

The fact that financial level is clearly related to perceived helpfulness of the self-study and planning programs is instructive because it indicates that extent of financial support can be crucial when more money means a very different type of program, not just more of the same. The "self-study and planning" program in the lowest financial category represented modest support for a master plan for physical facilities on the campus. By its nature it was somewhat specialized and involved only a limited number of the people at the institution. The planning program in the highest financial category represented support for an extensive and meaningful self-study program undertaken in preparation for the merger with a neighboring institution--a program that involved the total institution and was obviously of critical significance to its future.[8]

Faculty and Administrator Role

Given the different functions and perspectives of faculty and administrators in colleges and institutions, one might expect to find administrators and faculty differing in their perceptions of the Title III programs. Table 20 compares the faculty and administrators in the proportions who felt the different programs were "very important." The table also includes an "administrators and faculty" category since many of the administrators in these institutions maintain some teaching function.

It is clear in Table 20 that there is no consistent relationship between one's institutional role and one's feeling about the significance of Title III programs. What differences do appear are not systematic, and, given the small number of cases in the administrator categories, probably represent chance fluctuations.

Some difference does appear when we turn in Table 21 to the relationship between institutional role and the perception of the helpfulness of the different programs. Although the differences are sometimes small and they are not completely consistent, there is some tendency for administrators to see the programs as more helpful than do the faculty. While the faculty see the programs as just as important as do the administrators, they are somewhat more critical of the way in which the programs have been carried out, and of the benefit they have actually brought to the institution.

---

[8] These findings do not mean that large financial support for an extensive self-study program will always mean that the program will tend to be seen as beneficial. In this particular instance the interview data indicated there was strong support for the merger toward which the self-study was directed, and the feeling that the self-study had been helpful. Large funds do not by themselves guarantee that the self-study will be effective or directed towards goals approved by the majority of the institution's staff. But it is likely that it can not be very meaningful or extensive unless it has more than several thousand dollars funding.

TABLE 19

Relationship between Financial Level of Program and Feeling that Program is "Very Helpful"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Less than $10,000	$10,000-19,999	$20,000-34,999	$35,000-49,999	$50,000-69,999	$70,000-99,999	$100,000-149,999	$150,000 or more
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	27% (22)*			27% (26)	17% (12)			
Learning resources		18% (34)						32% (34)
Faculty development and faculty exchange		41% (17)	30% (92)	37% (54)	44% (102)			
Visiting Scholars	21% (24)			43% (14)			16% (86)	
National Teaching Fellows	29% (24)		38% (166)	43% (146)	35% (23)	50% (46)		
College Placement Services, Inc.	41% (71)		34% (59)					
Self-study and planning programs	30% (27)	61% (41)			75% (72)			

---

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

TABLE 20

Relationship between Administrative-Faculty Role and Feeling that Program is "Very Important"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Administrators	Administrators and Faculty	Faculty
Freshman Program I	57% (14)[*]	57% (23)	53% (133)
Freshman Program II	81% (21)	58% (12)	62% (99)
Other remedial programs	46% (11)	30% (10)	49% (73)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	67% (15)	30% (23)	41% (111)
Learning resources	42% (12)	--[**]	38% (64)
Consortium programs	--	36% (14)	25% (113)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	47% (38)	56% (41)	56% (230)
Visiting Scholars	23% (13)	20% (15)	23% (150)
National Teaching Fellows	58% (52)	58% (54)	51% (338)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	53% (17)	51% (111)
Student exchange	40% (10)	35% (23)	43% (115)
Cultural enrichment	50% (12)	20% (10)	40% (30)
Cooperative College Development Program	--	--	49% (35)
Self-study and planning programs	83% (12)	77% (17)	63% (145)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

TABLE 21

Relationship between Administrative-Faculty Role and Feeling that Program is "Very Helpful"

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

Title III Programs	Administrators	Administrators and Faculty	Faculty
Freshman Program I	57% (14)[*]	44% (23)	33% (131)
Freshman Program II	45% (20)	50% (12)	38% (97)
Other remedial programs	20% (10)	30% (10)	32% (68)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	43% (14)	30% (20)	14% (102)
Learning resources	39% (13)	--[**]	24% (62)
Consortium programs	--	31% (13)	16% (111)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	31% (36)	42% (41)	38% (221)
Visiting Scholars	15% (13)	7% (15)	17% (145)
National Teaching Fellows	54% (52)	46% (55)	35% (326)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	44% (18)	39% (104)
Student exchange	--	22% (23)	30% (112)
Cultural enrichment	42% (12)	30% (10)	22% (32)
Cooperative College Development Program	--	--	28% (36)
Self-study and planning programs	58% (12)	75% (16)	48% (142)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

Some reasons for this difference can be seen in Table 22, which compares the faculty and administrators in the extent of their formal relationship with the programs. Table 22 indicates that administrators much more often have a formal role in the programs--either as actual program staff, or interacting with the program as part of their role. In a sense, then, their greater perceptions of the programs' benefits to the institution that we observed in Table 21 represent a defense of their own role in these programs. The faculty having much less formal responsibility for the programs can afford to be somewhat more critical.

However, given the large differences in the degree of formal involvement in the programs, what is surprising is not that there is some difference in perceptions of faculty and administrators but that these differences are so slight. It is clear that in general Title III programs do not represent issues that divide administrators and faculty in these institutions.

Reactions to Bilateral Relationships

A major mechanism for implementing Title III has been the assistance given the developing institution by the relationship with a "developed" institution. Although the questionnaire contained only a couple of questions on these relationships, the findings are interesting and suggestive.

All questionnaires in institutions involved in a bilateral relationship included a question asking the faculty and administrative staff how they felt about the relationship, providing them with five alternatives ranging from "Very satisfied" to "Very dissatisfied" and a sixth alternative indicating no opinion. In addition, people who had an opinion were asked to write in the reasons for their dissatisfaction or satisfaction.

There have been many comments on the problems in these bilateral relationships, particularly problems arising out of the sensitivity of a relationship between institutions labelled "developed" and "developing." This has led to a great emphasis on the nature and style of these relationships. This was evident in the responses to the questionnaire, particularly in the reasons the faculty and administrators gave for their feelings. As expected, a large number who expressed any dissatisfaction mentioned dissatisfaction with the nature of the relationship rather than lack of concrete accomplishments of the program, pointing to such things as paternalism, condescension, arrogance, etc. But the concern with the style of the relationship is so great that even when talking positively about the cooperative program, relationship characteristics rather than concrete accomplishments were a predominant response. These positive relationship factors tended to be the mirror image of the negative characteristics mentioned as reasons for dissatisfaction--the people from the developed institution were not condescending, it was a mutual rather than a paternalistic relationship, etc.

Given the considerable questioning of these relationships, and the negative comments expressed by a number of people we interviewed as well as those answering the questionnaire, it is interesting that when presented with a question that asked people to balance all aspects of the relationship and place themselves on a five-point scale, the responses were predominantly favorable. About one out of five of our respondents indicated that they had no opinion about the bilateral relationship. The others tended to be fairly equally divided among the top three categories: "very satisfied," "fairly satisfied"

TABLE 22

Relationship between Administrative-Faculty Role and Formal Contact with Program

Title III Programs	Administrators	Administrators and Faculty	Faculty
Freshman Program I	62% (13)[*]	50% (26)	16% (156)
Freshman Program II	91% (21)	58% (12)	34% (105)
Other remedial programs	36% (11)	--[**]	22% (89)
Curriculum development in specific disciplines	60% (15)	31% (26)	12% (176)
Learning resources	29% (14)	--	15% (79)
Consortium programs	60% (10)	71% (14)	37% (119)
Faculty development and faculty exchange	49% (41)	48% (42)	23% (266)
Visiting Scholars	35% (20)	25% (16)	17% (176)
National Teaching Fellows	44% (61)	28% (60)	15% (444)
College Placement Services, Inc.	--	41% (22)	13% (160)
Student exchange	--	33% (24)	18% (126)
Cultural enrichment	55% (11)	--	11% (44)
Cooperative College Development Program	41% (17)	--	10% (70)
Self-study and planning programs	75% (12)	88% (17)	51% (148)

---

[*] Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of cases on which percentages are based.

[**] Percentages not computed because number of cases is less than ten.

TABLE 23a

Feelings about Bilateral Relationships of Predominantly Negro and White Institutions

	Predominantly Negro	Predominantly White
Very satisfied	28%	30%
Fairly satisfied	25	21
Satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others	23	8
Fairly dissatisfied	2	0
Very dissatisfied	3	0
No opinion--don't know anything about it	19	41
Total	100%	100%
Number	399	53

TABLE 23b

Feelings about Bilateral Relationships of Predominantly Negro and White Institutions

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

	Predominantly Negro	Predominantly White
Very satisfied	34%	52%
Fairly satisfied	31	35
Satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others	29	13
Fairly dissatisfied	3	0
Very dissatisfied	3	0
Total	100%	100%
Number	324	31

TABLE 24a

Relationship between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feelings about Bilateral Relationships

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Very satisfied	22%	26%	34%	23%	30%
Fairly satisfied	23	19	32	25	21
Satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others	25	26	16	33	8
Fairly dissatisfied	5	2	2	2	0
Very dissatisfied	4	1	3	4	0
No opinion--don't know anything about it	21	26	13	13	41
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number	100	117	134	48	53

TABLE 24b

Relationship between Institutional "Quality" Rating and Feelings about Bilateral Relationships

(Excluding those who had "No Opinion")

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
Very satisfied	28%	36%	40%	26%	52%
Fairly satisfied	29	25	37	29	35
Satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others	32	36	18	38	13
Fairly dissatisfied	6	2	2	2	0
Very dissatisfied	5	1	3	5	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number	79	87	117	42	31

and "satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others." Only five percent checked the "fairly dissatisfied"or "very dissatisfied" categories. These responses in no way negate the problems in these relationships and the tensions they produce. But they do put these problems in some perspective.

The problems of sensitivity in the bilateral relationships are exacerbated by the fact that most of these bilateral relationships involve the collaboration of a predominantly Negro southern institution and an elite predominantly white institution in the north. We were interested, then, in whether reactions to bilateral relationships were related to this issue. Tables 23a and 23b compare the reactions to bilateral relationships of people from predominantly Negro institutions in our sample with those from a predominantly white institution. Unfortunately, only one of the predominantly white developing institutions in our sample was involved in a bilateral relationship, so the findings in Tables 23a and 23b are only suggestive. But they do suggest the expected relationship--faculty and administrators in predominantly Negro institutions are somewhat more negative to these relationships.

In a similar vein, we expected that the sensitivity to the inequalities in these relationships might be exacerbated in those institutions of lowest resources and "quality." Table 24 presents the relationship between our institutional "quality" rating and feelings about bilateral relationships. The level 5 institution is the predominantly white institution noted in Table 23, and therefore should not be considered in this quality comparison. The level 4 figures may also be ignored since they represent only one institution, which makes generalization difficult. Within the lower three levels, there appears to be a positive relationship between higher "quality" characteristics and degree of satisfaction with the bilateral arrangement, and a negative relationship between "quality" level and "no opinion" on this matter. Considering all respondents, two-thirds of those from level 3 institutions are very satisfied or fairly satisfied with the bilateral relationship, while fewer than half of the respondents from the level 1 or level 2 institutions feel this way about their bilateral arrangements. The difference between level 3 and level 1 respondents is even more marked when those with "no opinion" are excluded (Table 24b).

Both sets of relationships depicted in Tables 23 and 24--that criticism of bilateral relationships is greater among predominantly Negro institutions, and among those lowest in resources and "quality"--conform to our other findings that these relationships are sensitive, and the nature and style of the relationship an important aspect of peoples' reactions to it. But again, it should be underscored, that these criticisms do not negate the positive functions these relationships have served, even in the eyes of people with these criticisms.

CHAPTER VII

SPECIAL ISSUES

1. Evaluation and Research

Evaluation and research can have some bearing on several types and levels of questions that are faced by people responsible for administering a program such as Title III. At the broadest, and yet perhaps most immediate level, there are questions that arise around the funding decisions that the people administering federal programs continually have to make. For those administering Title III funds, there are really two major funding decisions - which programs to support and which institutions to support. This latter issue, the question of which institutions to support, particularly is a problem in the administration of Title III funds. Of course, all agencies must take account of the capabilities of an institution or an individual in judging whether to fund a particular proposal. But, for most agencies, this judgment is based on the institution's existing facilities and resources as well as on its past history of output and fulfillment. Title III administrators, however, are faced with the much more difficult problem of estimating institutional "potential," where the judgment is not on present and past accomplishments but on the potential for future payoffs. It is understandable, therefore, that a major concern in evaluative efforts on the part of Title III up to now has been the attempt to identify criteria for such institutional potential.

Nevertheless, the functions of those administering Title III go much beyond decisions of whom and what to support. Therefore, evaluation and research can also be addressed to these broader functions. In a basic sense, Title III represents a major commitment to experiments in institutional innovation and change. The word "experiment" is used advisedly, for the territory is largely unexplored and few established guidelines exist on how to implement the kinds of purposes that are the focus of Title III's concern. Research and evaluation have a very crucial role to play in helping those responsible for Title III to coordinate these experimental thrusts, to systematize and generalize what is learned from the experiences of diverse projects in a multitude of institutions, to provide data on the effectiveness of different programs and the conditions under which different programs can be maximally effective, to help separate the fruitful approaches from those which turn out to be less helpful, and to point the way for new directions and orientations. This type of evaluation involves systematic cross-institutional research on effectiveness of different programs and the factors related to effectiveness. The research needed covers all facets of Title III endeavors, from relatively narrow and specific questions such as the effectiveness of given curricular approaches and teaching styles for given types of students in given types of institutions, to broader questions relating to basic internal and external reorientations of these institutions, including issues of interinstitutional cooperation and integration.

Evaluation, then, covers a wide range of purposes, from helping judge how well a given institution has utilized program funds and whether support to that particular institution should be continued, to the development of a set of general guidelines on programs and procedures that would be relevant and useful to all institutions whose struggles and aspirations Title III has decided to support.

The evaluation and research study that is the subject of this report is addressed to only some of these evaluation questions and even these in only a preliminary "first step" fashion. This has really been an "in house" evaluation which uses the technique of sending a small team of interviewers to spend several days at a given institution, interviewing selected representatives of administrators, faculty and students. The major advantage of having this type of procedure conducted by an outside agency rather than the federal agency responsible for Title III is the possibility that people in the institutions would speak more honestly and frankly to outsiders than to the people making the funding decisions. This advantage was minimized in this particular study because of the unusually open and cooperative relationship established between the institutions and the Washington representatives of Title III.

Some attempt was made in this study to supplement this traditional approach to evaluation by gathering some systematic quantitative data in some brief questionnaires administered to the faculty and administrators in the institutions studied. The results from this questionnaire are presented more fully elsewhere in this report. As we note in that discussion, the data one can gather in this type of questionnaire pertain to only some of the questions that are relevant for evaluation. For example, faculty's and administrators' opinions are very relevant to the question of whether a given program is addressing significant or superficial institutional needs, since faculty and administrators do have knowledge about their institution's important needs. Their opinions are less relevant to the question of how effective the program has been in implementing these needs. The judgment of effectiveness requires more objective validating criteria than an individual feeling that all is going very well. Moreover, even in the instances where opinions are meaningful, the opinions of the faculty and administrators are not the only ones of relevance. In a number of the programs - for example, those oriented toward curricular changes and teaching techniques - relevant effectiveness criteria would have come from the students. Student data should include not only objective data on their changes in performance as a function of these innovative courses, but also their attitudes and feelings about their courses. Given our limitations in time and resources, we could not gather large scale, systematic, quantitative data on the students in these institutions. However, even in the unsystematic interviewing of students that we were able to accomplish, it was clear that in a number of instances a program viewed very positively by most of the faculty and administrators at an institution was seen much more critically by the students directly involved.

Given these limitations in our study, our comments on research and evaluation are addressed to the role they may hopefully play in the future, rather than in any way using our study as a model for the functions they may perform. One of our major concerns in this study has been the attempt to think through the role that evaluation and research might play in furthering the objectives of Title III and to point out what we feel are the more fruitful and meaningful directions for this research to take. It is to this concern that the following comments are directed.

Basically, our discussion is organized around the following argument: that efforts at systematic quantitative evaluation and research would be better directed at the program than at the institutional level. We will first discuss some of the problems that arise when one attempts broad institutional evaluations - problems in measuring institutional "potential" and "quality" and "impact" - and then indicate some ways in which more systematic, programmatic evaluation might be instituted.

The Measurement of Institutional "Potential" and "Quality"

The purpose of Title III is not to support all higher education institutions that are in need, but rather to support those that are seen as having a potential for movement. The "ing" in the word "developing" is crucial. It is natural, then, that a major interest in the evaluations conducted under Title III has been the attempt to identify objective criteria for determining institutional potential, and for measuring the degree of institutional change that results from the introduction of Title III support. This was the major purpose of the study directed by Dr. Lawrence Howard; it was also one issue to which the present study was addressed.

The problems that these issues pose for research are extremely difficult ones. The notion of institutional potential is difficult to conceptualize and to translate into quantitative measures. When one visits a campus, one sometimes gets a feeling of excitement and major commitment that is not captured in such traditional criteria as the proportion of faculty with doctorates.

The problems in using traditional criteria in the evaluation of developing institutions are evident in the tentative efforts that have been made in our own as well as Dr. Howard's study. For example, in our study we were interested in exploring the relationship between the effect of Title III and the "quality" and resources of the institution. One current hypothesis in organizational theory is that there are greater possibilities for innovation in organizations that already have greater facilities and resources, that institutions where the need is most desperate are so involved in the struggle for survival and day-to-day maintenance that they cannot afford the "luxury" of innovation. To examine this hypothesis, we rated the institutions we studied into five "quality" categories, according to a summary score based on some of the usual institutional criteria: faculty Ph.D.'s, entering SAT scores, financial resources, student-teacher ratio, library resources. As we have discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report (Chapter VI), we found no relationship in the responses to the questionnaires between the "quality" rating of the institution and the faculty and administrators' perceptions of the importance, the usefulness, and the impact of the different Title III programs. If anything, there was a hint of a reverse relationship - that is, in the institutions where the need was greatest, Title III programs were sometimes seen as more important and crucial to the institution.

This general finding is also supported by our impressions from the interviews. We found most excitement and feeling of innovation in two or three institutions which rated relatively low on the traditional quality criteria. The very desperateness of their plight meant that these institutions brought in new presidents, revamped the Board of Trustees and its relationship to the institution, and started a whole new orientation to their purposes and functions. In a desperate situation under imaginative leadership, innovation becomes a basic need instead of a luxury, becomes in a sense the major raison d'etre of the institution. Of course, in such institutions there still is the issue of whether the traditional criteria indicate a limited capacity to carry through the innovative attempts; but certainly the impulse to innovation does not seem to be related to traditional criteria of institutional quality and may even be greatest in the "lowest" schools.

The Measurement of Title III Institutional "Impact"

It is customary after documenting the inadequacies of initial attempts in research and evaluation to end with a plea for further research. In this instance, one could cite such a need, beginning with the importance of developing criteria of potential and quality more relevant to the situation and purposes of these particular institutions. However, if we are interested in measuring potential and quality in order to attempt an assessment of the impact of Title III on a total institution, this is probably an area where future research, at least in the systematic quantitative sense, is not the answer. While crucial issues are represented in the attempts to identify institutions of potential and test whether Title III has helped translate this potential into development and growth, they are probably structured too broadly and too generally to enable them to be answered by systematic quantitative studies. Even if one could derive adequate quantitative measures of potential quality and the change in institutional quality, it really would not be possible to relate change in quality to the specific impact of Title III. If we had what we felt were appropriate measures of quality, we could see over a period of years whether Title III had made decisions to support schools that were "moving" or "developing" according to these criteria. But this would not answer the critical question of what part Title III played in this growth and development, since the institutions with this capacity, with the ability to attract Title III funds, are also more proficient in attracting other funds. In a sense, we might have the paradox of Title III funds going to those institutions that are growing and developing, but actually having relatively less impact on those schools than they would have had on much more marginally developing schools, where Title III funds might have been more unique and more critical to the things these schools were able to do.

The Need for Systematic Program Evaluation

What we recommend is not to abandon attempts to evaluate the impact of Title III funds, but rather to redirect the evaluative function away from the general impact of Title III on the total institution to a more specific focus on the effects and accomplishments of specific Title III programs.[1] For example, this might be evaluating the impact of the National Teaching Fellow program by studying their functions and meaning at all institutions where the program is supported. While systematic quantitative research on individual programs would still present difficult and in some instances even insoluble problems, it should be more possible than objective efforts to research a question phrased as broadly as "Have Title III funds to institution X helped in its development?"

Focusing evaluation efforts on the program rather than the total institution would not necessarily be unduly narrow. In many instances, the effectiveness of a program would be measured in terms of broad institution-wide impact; indeed, one criterion of effectiveness might be the extent and breadth of its impact.[2]

---

[1] We are not suggesting that Title III administrators be unconcerned with the issue of which institutions to fund. We discuss this issue more fully and suggest some guidelines in our section on "The Selection of Institutions to Fund." What we are suggesting in our comments is that these questions are not subject to systematic quantitative research.

[2] It should be noted, however, that any attempt to measure the institution-wide impact of a given program will present unusual difficulties. The desire to attempt it despite these difficulties stems from the fact that the purposes of Title III are directed toward affecting the total institution, so that the evaluation of any Title III program involves an assessment of the breadth of its effect and its ramifications throughout the institution. The impact of National Teaching Fellows or Visiting Scholars should be measured not only by what happens

But the evaluative focus would still be the individual program. It is admittedly a somewhat atomistic approach. It does not deal directly with such issues as the interaction of different programs, or whether there is a "critical mass" of innovative attempts. But even these questions might be handled better if we began with the attempt to trace through specific impacts of individual programs.

There is another point that might be mentioned in this connection. The attempt to make global judgments without building them on solid data about specific programmatic impacts may be very deceptive. Without such data there is a tendency to make judgments on the basis of the energy and creativity of the critical people one meets at the institutions - president, deans, program heads. However, we did not get the feeling in our campus visits that top leadership qualities were always translated into effective running of specific programs and the fulfillment of these program purposes. For example, the ultimate test of an innovative curriculum is how the students react to it, what they learn, and what impact it has on their total development; the creativity of the top administrators or even of the teachers in these innovative classes does not always get translated into these kinds of results. It is only by systematic investigation at the program level that one can ultimately evaluate the impact of the creative and innovative leaders and what they have attempted to do.

However, to say that program evaluation is needed does not define the nature of this evaluation, or the mechanisms that should be adopted for implementing it. Many issues are relevant here, some of which will be noted in the following pages.

The Purpose of Program Evaluation

We have already commented in our introductory remarks that perhaps the major need in the evaluation area is to shift its emphasis from one of judgment and assessment to one of understanding. Evaluation and research can make its greatest contribution to Title III not by grading given institutions and programs on their "success" or "failure," but in trying to answer the questions of "why" and "how." The crucial function is to guarantee that the experiences in these early formative years of Title III provide systematic data-based feedback

---

to the students in their classes, but by the stimulation they provide for the other faculty throughout the institution; the value of innovative freshman programs should be measured not only by the students' increased learning in the freshman year, but by the pressures for innovative and creative teaching that the program presents to all faculty in the institution; the effects of a program supporting administrative improvement should be seen not as the increased efficiency of one specific bureau but as facilitating the work of all members of the institution.

To some extent this desire to have an institution-wide impact may represent an ideal but essentially unattainable goal, and it might be more realistic to settle for the accumulation of more restricted impacts of a series of programs in an institution. In some instances, however, a broader impact is necessary in order for even the specific program objectives to be met. If students emerge from an innovative freshman program with a sense of excitement and inner-directedness about learning only to have the spark extinguished during the rest of their school career, the program has failed in its immediate as well as its broad objectives.

to the Title III administrators. The ultimate goal of evaluation and research is to help Title III develop a set of programs and suggested procedures that can serve as guidelines to all the institutions whose struggles Title III funds will be attempting to help in the future.

Present Evaluative Efforts

If we look at the attempts at evaluation now going on in the program, it is clear that such a research and evaluation program is not under way at the present time. Very little systematic research is actually being conducted, and most of what is being done tends to be haphazard and uncoordinated. The most systematic coordinated attempts at evaluation are occurring with respect to some of the innovative curricular programs like ISE, but even here the attempts are limited. Moreover, the great desire not to interfere unduly with an institution's autonomy means that each institution is doing the research differently enough to make systematic cross-institutional comparisons impossible. This is true even in a very coordinated program like ISE, where we found that the process of selecting students into the ISE programs differed in different institutions. This alone seriously handicaps any attempt at cross-institutional comparison of impact and effects.

The lack of systematic evaluation and research is not a peculiarity of the administration of Title III. It has been a problem in all federal programs, which have felt that any attempt to provide the broader coordinating integration that is implied in a systematic research program would infringe on the autonomy of the local organizations running the programs. Among other reasons, then, the fear of attempting to impose too much federal control has hindered the federal agencies in their role of systematically coordinating and evaluating the operations of the innumerable local organizations carrying through their programs. But when one is attempting to deal with very difficult problems that demand innovative programs, when one is moving into uncharted areas, the lack of systematic research and evaluation has disastrous consequences. A prime example is the federal poverty program where the tragedy is not that after five years and billions of dollars people are beginning to say that it has "failed," but that one really cannot say whether it succeeded or failed, what aspects were more or less successful, what program techniques and conditions worked best with what kinds of people. Unless Title III makes a major commitment to evaluation and research, it will be forced to make its future decisions on the uncertain bases of impressions and hunches.

The Need for Federal Direction

The first issue, then, is the need for Washington to set the highest priority on evaluation and research and accept the responsibility for leading and coordinating these efforts. It is clear that at the present time evaluation does not have this priority. A rather striking example of its low priority occurred at one institution where a young social scientist of unusual ability and national prominence had begun a program of evaluation and research, obtaining a great deal of test and attitudinal data on the entering freshman class. Included in the request for Title III support were funds to enable the follow-up of these students as they proceeded through their four-year career at the institution. This research would have enabled one to compare the effects and changes in students involved in various Title III and other programs with the changes in students not involved in these programs. However, because of the need to restrict funding, this institution, like most others, received less than it requested, and it made the decision that this evaluative program had low priority and was expendable. We came across still another instance of a social scientist involved in a similar research program, who was receiving support from other sources but not from Title III.

It is understandable when funds are limited and Title III assigns to each individual institution the decision as to which programs to support and which to cut, that research and evaluation will have a low priority. Given the desperate financial situation of these institutions, it would be most unusual if research were not seen as a luxury. Therefore, the responsibility for setting high priority on research must be accepted in Washington, and funds must be specifically allotted for these purposes.

The Need for Cross-Institutional Research

But more is required than the funding of the research of individual institutions, no matter how capable the people conducting the research. When a given type of program is being supported in many institutions, when the effectiveness of a given program is probably not a "yes or no" question but very much dependent on the particular methods utilized in the program, where the impact depends on institutional as well as program characteristics, the crucial need is for cross-institutional research, for coordinated studies using the same measurement and evaluation techniques so one can make systematic comparisons across the programs of different institutions. We would recommend that all major Title III programs have a corrdinating evaluation committee consisting of representatives of the participating institutions and the Title III Washington office. Where a given program is being instituted in a very large number of institutions, it is not necessary to include all in the evaluation and research program; it is necessary only to include enough institutions to provide a representation of different types of institutions, methods, and approaches that are being utilized in the program.

Some of the problems such institutional cooperation might raise could be handled by having an outside agency actually conduct the research. Placing the responsibility for conducting the research in this single agency would insure that the research was conducted in comparable ways at all institutions. The fact that the agency was outside any of the institutions could guarantee anonymity in the sense that each individual institution, while being told the results of its institution as well as some of the general results from the evaluation, would not know the particular findings relevant to the other particular institutions. With an outside agency conducting the actual research, the role of Title III representatives would be to develop the objectives for the study, help define the criteria for measuring effectiveness or failure, and review the research as it proceeded step by step.

While commitment to such a major coordinative research and evaluation effort would raise some obvious problems, in some ways this cooperative and research-oriented approach might actually make evaluation more, rather than less, acceptable to the participating institutions. At the present time evaluation is so identified with judgments of individual institutional success or failure that it creates anxiety and defensiveness and the need for each institution to proclaim what a fine job it had done. Where understanding and learning and implications for the future become the focus of evaluation, institutions might be less antagonistic to the process and more ready to use it for honest self-analysis and self-correction.

Research Ability of Title III Programs

It should also be noted that some of the major Title III programs are unusually amenable to systematic quantitative research. One argument that has always been made against the attempt to subject massive federal programs to systematic research-oriented quantitative evaluation is that such research is impossible, that the impact and effectiveness of these programs is not really quantifiable, that "you can't count the things that really count." But this is not true for a number of the major Title III programs. The innovative freshman programs, for example, provide unusual opportunities for systematic research. The effects they are trying to achieve are very quantifiable and measurable. It is true that some imagination is needed in this process of quantification. For example, if an English course is attempting to give students a feeling for the way writers use words to create images rather than focusing on rules of grammar, it is not appropriate to evaluate the course by the standard achievement test which relies heavily on knowledge of grammar. But it is certainly not impossible to devise new tests to measure the types of achievement these programs are attempting to influence. Moreover, the other hoped-for consequences of such programs - the increased interest in learning, the inner-directed motivation, the effect on students' aspirations and feelings of competence - are all quantifiable and measurable. In a longitudinal study that follows students through their four-year career, it is also possible to examine the longer range impact of such programs - for example, analyzing the problems and issues that arise when the students from these programs confront the more traditional teaching that is available to them in the upper class courses.

The freshman programs under Title III even have one characteristic which is almost unique in research studies in actual field situations, and that is the possibility for establishing meaningful "experimental" and "control" groups. Since these programs are experimental and therefore not directed to all the freshmen for whom they would be relevant, it is legitimate to assign students randomly to these programs. This would permit one to test the differences between the effects of being in these programs as opposed to being in the more traditional curriculum, in a way not possible when students entering the two programs are different.

Of course, not all of the programs supported by Title III present the ideal conditions and opportunities for systematic research that are offered by the freshman curricula programs. But even in those instances where criteria for effectiveness are much less tangible and quantifiable, where "pure" controls are not possible, where the relationship between program characteristics and effects will not be clearly determinable, the very attempt to subject programs to systematic evaluation will enhance the self-examination that is crucial if Title III programs are to proceed from their initial exploratory approaches to a set of programs and procedures that are maximally relevant and useful to the problems and needs of the developing institutions.

2. The Selection of Institutions to Fund

One of the major dilemmas facing the Development Institutions program is the selection of institutions to fund. A large amount of discussion and some serious study have been devoted to attempts to answer this question. The goal has been the identification of some criteria or procedures which could be used in as automatic and impersonal a way as possible to differentiate between institutions which would benefit from funding and those that would not. The major study undertaken by Lawrence C. Howard was an important effort to reach this goal through a quantitative analysis of basic programmatic information about institutions and the current study was yet another major attempt to reach the same goals through an intensive study of programs at a limited number of developing institutions. A major finding of both studies is that there is no easy and automatic method for evaluating institutional potential.

Developing institutions are by definition institutions which in some respects are marginal. Despite the fact that the institutions funded under the Developing Institutions Act vary greatly as to institutional strengths as measured by such conventional yardsticks as student-faculty ratio, percent of faculty with earned doctorates, size of library, size of endowment, etc., virtually all of the institutions funded fall at the lower end of the spectrum when compared to all American higher educational institutions. The few exceptions to this generalization represent instances in which the institution in question was probably misclassified as a "developing institution" when the grant to it was approved.

It is generally accepted in American higher education that the measures used to differentiate quality levels of institutions are crude and inadequate. They serve to differentiate the very good from the mediocre from the poor, but they do not permit fine discriminations to be made among institutions. This being the case, any attempt to apply these measures to a group of institutions which by definition fall within the same limited range on the higher education spectrum is bound to produce weak or inaccurate rank orderings of institutions. This is true at the upper end of the quality spectrum where three or four major attempts during the past fifty years to rank orderings of institutions. This is true at the upper end of the quality spectrum where three or four major attempts during the past fifty years to rank order the "best" universities in the nation all have been criticized as inadequate. By the same token, attempts to utilize quantitative measures to rank order institutions clustered in the middle of the spectrum or at the lower end of the spectrum are certain to prove inadequate.

The developing institutions which the Developing Institutions Program was set up to assist are by definition "risk" institutions. They are institutions which in one way or another are weak or outside the mainstream of American higher education. Obviously they are institutions in which the likelihood of institutional failure is greater than usual. Given this fact, the best which can be hoped for is that the number of "success" stories can be maximized. It cannot be guaranteed--indeed, a strong attempt to fund only institutions in which success is reasonably assured almost certainly would elminate from the program those institutions for which the program really was designed, i.e., institutions which are teetering between success and failure and for which assistance from the Developing Institutions can be crucial in bringing about success. If the Developing Institutions Program experienced nothing but success, one would have to question whether it was investing in enough genuine risk situations to live up to its original purpose.

The problem of defining and delimiting the clientele group might be thought of in terms of drawing the four sides around a rectangular box. The top line represents the level of institutional development beyond which an institution is no longer in the Developing Institutions category. The bottom line represents a floor beneath which institutions are so impossibly weak that they cannot be "strengthened." The lines at either side represent the range of institutional types and of reasons for needing assistance--cultural isolation as in the case of some predominantly Negro institutions and Catholic institutions, geographic isolation, financial deprivation, etc.

Developing institutions in nearly all cases are small institutions and they also are weak institutions in many if not all respects--percent of doctorates held by faculty, size of library, student-faculty ratio, faculty salary levels, quantity and quality of administrative support services, etc. Developing institutions differ from one another markedly in at least three ways which relate to potential for viability: (1) in the degree to which there has been change on the campus; (2) in the degree of enthusiasm among faculty, students, and administrators; and (3) in the presence or absence of a coterie of energetic, enthusiastic, and charismatic leaders on the campuses.

These factors typically are found in association with one another. A coterie of energetic leaders appears to be the most frequent cause for general enthusiasm and high morale on a developing institution campus, and often relates directly to recent institutional changes on the campus which faculty and students perceive as forward movement. The specific types of changes are less important than the fact that change is taking place and the institution is perceived as virgorous.

It is no accident that developing institutions with the qualities just mentioned--dynamic leadership, relatively high morale, and evidence of change--also are campuses which receive relatively substantial amounts of outside financial assistance. Foundations, governmental agencies, and private donors all view these particular institutions as worth the investment because of the factors mentioned.

Is this simply a bubble which will burst? Is the institution so dependent upon one or two individuals that their departure would burst the bubble? Is the institution living off temporary outside funding which, once withdrawn, will leave the institution bankrupt? These are serious questions to which there is no simple yes or no. Just as one cannot differentiate between two weak institutions by ascertaining that one has a few more library books than the other, so one cannot ascertain with precision that the spirit of vitality and enthusiasm within the institution would be affected in some precisely measurable degree by the removal of a particular individual or a particular amount of outside funding. Obviously the institution would be adversely affected by either of these eventualities; whether the bubble would burst rather than just shrinking in size is not precisely ascertainable.

The whole movement of a successfully developing institution is from a condition of utter weakness, through a period of developing leadership, developing esprit de corps, the accrual of outside funding, the accumulating of permanent sources of funding, the effective implementation of permanent organizational curricular and personnel changes, to a stage of sufficient stability that the removal of any single factor no longer can demolish it. This process can be compared to the development of a learning-growing child through the period of adolescence. If any one factor of support is removed--one parent, well-balanced meals, adequate housing, adequate education--the individual is apt to be injured but the precise extent of the injury cannot be predetermined. In the case of most developing institutions, just as in the case of many developing human beings, one starts out with the knowledge that not all of the desirable elements of support are present to begin with. The issue really is whether enough of them are present in sufficient strength to provide a minimum base for growth and development. The problem of assessing this is complicated by the fact that the success seems to depend not only upon the presence of minimum support factors but also upon the combination in which they are found, the ability of extra strength in some to offset weaknesses in others, and the difference among institutions (as among humans) in the "will to live" and in the "drive to attain."

The crucial factors of leadership and institutional spirit are not easily quantifiable, although they are susceptible to judgmental assessment. The desire on the part of many people within and outside the Developing Institutions Program to minimize the element of judgment in decision-making about institutional support is understandable. There is not a quantified substitute available, however, and therefore judgments must continue to be made. It is better that this fact be recognized and that the areas in which judgements are necessary be clearly identified and delimited than that the alternatives of inadequate quantification or the secret exercise of judgment be utilized.

Judgement is most necessary and least susceptible to a quantified alternative in the following areas:

1. The presence of absence of a coterie of leaders in the institution (or that segment of the institution involved in the proposed Title III activity).

2. The presence of a positive institutional spirit in the institution (or that part of the institution directly related to the proposed Title III activity) or the prospects for developing such a spirit.

3. The receptiveness (present or potential) of institutional personnel to the types of changes which the proposed program would necessitate or would be designed to bring about.

These judgmental factors can and must be set within a more general context which attempts to take into account the quantifiable aspects of institutional viability. These include the institution's financial base (present and potential) and the extent to which the institution falls below acceptable norms on such matters as faculty preparation, library size, etc. An institution which falls far below acceptable norms obviously has the longer road to travel before it reaches viability, and therefore the potential in terms of leadership and spirit will need to be greater. (When leadership is present, this type of institution may be worth a greater risk than a "safer" institution which lacks leadership and spirit.)

Another way of summarizing what has been stated is that the Title III program would be well advised to look at the quantifiable factors associated with individual institutions and then, using these as broad perameters, "bet" program money on individual institutional leaders, leadership groups within institutions, and high morale situations (in total institutions or subunits within institutions). In making such "bets," it would be well to hedge to the extent of ascertaining that a charismatic leader is backed up by a few other individuals with leadership ability and that he enjoys popular support on his own campus, so that the original bet is not totally dependent upon one person. Similarly, the presence of a leadership group in one segment of an institution would be judged also in terms of the amount of support or resistance from other parts of the institution. These qualifications are simply further extensions of the exercise of judgement. In addition, they suggest that some face-to-face contact with faculty members and students in a given campus is an invaluable supplement to the institution's formal application for Title III assistance.

An important consideration in some situations where energetic leadership is present is the extent of the individual's current commitments to other activities. In an institution which is relatively short on talent and imagination, it is possible for a single individual to get over-committed simply because he has the energy and the ability to dream up worthwhile projects and unwillingly becomes the "front man" for more than he can actually handle. In such a situation, one possible conclusion is that the individual is overcommitted and the proposal should not be funded. A more constructive approach in terms of continuing institutional development would seem to be negotiations for the institution to recruit additional staff intentionally chosen for the qualities of leadership, enthusiasm, and imagination which will help to develop a pool of talent within the institution. The process of institutional development might be described as movement toward a "critical mass" of imaginative, cooperating but self-sufficient individuals who complement one another and protect the institution against disaster should any one of them leave.

3. Title III Program Priorities

It is apparent from our interviews and questionnaires that faculty and administrators at the developing institutions overwhelmingly tend to see the programs of Title III as fulfilling important institutional needs. Although there is some differentiation among the different Title III programs--some programs are seen as more important and useful than others--in most instances there does not seem to be much question or issue about the significance of the particular programs that are being supported. In our discussion of specific programs we have indicated instances where we felt greater support might be given to some existing programs, and others which we felt might perhaps be reconsidered and even eliminated. But in general, there is no question of the value of most of the existing emphases.

We may, however, question whether there are not some other areas that Title III is not now supporting, or only minimally supporting, that might become a greater focus of Title III support. One area of potential support applies specifically to predominantly Negro institutions. In our visits to the campuses, particularly in our interviews with presidents and other top administrators at the institutions, we asked people to specify what they felt the major functions and purposes of an institution such as theirs might be. At predominantly Negro institutions, two areas were often noted. People felt that these institutions had a special purpose in providing a college education for students whose deficient educational background made them unacceptable to other institutions of higher education. The second area was the focus on Afro-American studies; a number of those we interviewed mentioned that these institutions have a special role to play in [illegible] development of programs specifically relevant to Negro Americans.

Despite the fact that most people mentioned these two different areas, it was clear both in terms of what actually was being done at the campuses, and specifically what Title III was supporting, that the major programs and efforts were directed toward the first area of interest, serving students with deficient educational backgrounds. We find at these institutions the highest priority on remedial programs and curricular revisions, particularly in the freshman or pre-freshman year, and we find this priority supported in the Title III funding decisions. Most institutions are doing relatively little in developing programs of "Afro-American studies," and in those instances where programs were being developed, they were generally not funded by Title III or other governmental agencies, but tended to be supported by private foundations.

In one or two instances, people at the institutions commented negatively on the fact that Title III was not supporting these endeavors with remarks on the "conservatism" and "traditionalism" of Title III support. However, it should be noted that the demand for such support from Title III was by no means widespread. To some extent this reflects the fact that in many institutions, despite the fact that Afro-American studies were mentioned as a high priority, there seemed to be some ambivalence about how involved the school would actually become in this area. In a number of instances, people we interviewed seemed to see a dichotomy between focusing on traditional educational concerns and developing programs around issues of black identity and community involvement. To a considerable extent, this may be due to the fact that the identity emphasis had become associated with student activism and the sometimes violent disruptions at these institutions. Thus, the president of one institution with a history of civil rights activism and involvement in community activities, but one where actually less is now being done than was done four or five years ago, remarked, "Educational institutions like _________ must give first priority to its educational program and second priority to social action, important though it is." The academic dean at another institution which is also less involved in programs like VISTA and Headstart than it was several years ago commented, "The number one job here is education, not social action."

This tendency to identify black studies programs with social action may have limited the extent to which most of these institutions might have proceeded innovatively in this area, seeing these programs as integrated with rather than antagonistic to the educational experience. At a number of institutions there are isolated examples of this integration, such as a sociology research course built around an actual study of the surrounding community, but this orientation rarely represents an integrated dominant thrust of the institution.[1]

Although there was no general demand in the institutions we studied that Title III support these endeavors, this is an instance where Title III might assume leadership and encourage and even initiate some of these integrative attempts. Higher education institutions all over the country are in a state of turmoil because of their students' demands for relevance. These demands are occurring frequently at the institutions of "highest" quality and these institutions find it particularly difficult to meet such demands. In this area, the "developing" institutions supported by Title III might have a very special opportunity to show how the demands for relevance can be integrated with the more traditional educational concerns to make for a more meaningful educational experience.

4. Relationships with Washington

One of the very striking findings that was clear in the study was the positiveness of the feelings of the people we interviewed toward the Washington representatives of Title III. They are very generally seen as friends who understand the problems of the developing institutions, are concerned about helping them, and are as flexible as possible in implementing the program.

---

[1] A specific example of an innovative program in this area is one developed at one of these institutions which builds the social science research training around a large-scale annual survey interview focusing on problems and issues in the surrounding community. This not only provides a vehicle for student learning and training, but also enables faculty at the institution to pursue their research interests. This program is supported by a grant from a private foundation.

There were some criticisms of the implementation of Title III, although these were not directed personally at the Washington people responsible for running the program. Two major types of criticism came up often in our interviews. One was related to the lateness of the notification that a proposal was accepted and the programs would be funded. This was particularly a problem because so many of the Title III programs depend on hiring new people or on arranging visiting and exchange relationships with faculty outside the developing institution. By the time notification was received that the program was funded, most people had already made commitments for the coming year. There were many complaints of the inability to find really good National Teaching Fellows or to make faculty exchange relationships in the short time available after the notification of funding.

There was some comment that this timing problem was better in the year of our interviewing, because notification had come somewhat earlier. However, some of the people we interviewed noted that while a few months difference in time was important, the issue was broader than that--that what was really the problem was the one-year nature of the funding. Given the experimental and long-range character of most of these programs--for example, the innovative curricula programs--we would certainly agree that the limitations of one-year funding have serious and often crippling implications. We would urge legislative changes that would enable a longer term commitment for these programs (of course, with the usual contingency of availability of funds). The kinds of problems these programs are dealing with need a longer time perspective for planning, experimenting, and evaluation. To force the programs to "produce" and justify themselves year by year presents unrealistic pressures that ultimately redound to the disadvantage of the purposes of Title III. The push is toward the superficial, the "flashy", the apparent payoff.

One other general criticism of the implementation of Title III was the desire for greater flexibility in permitting institutions to transfer funds among the different Title III programs. Again, this was not a criticism of the people in Washington; as a matter of fact, there were a number of comments that the Washington representatives were as flexible as the regulations permitted them to be on this issue. The criticism was of the rules which have strictures against transferring funds from one program to another. In some sense, this is related to the problems of lateness and one-year funding since a number of people indicated that by the time funds became available, they discovered that they were not able to implement a given program in the year allotted. Also, as the work developed, they would discover that they had greater requirements in some programs than others and would have liked to have been able to transfer the funds.

If carried to the ultimate extreme, the desire for flexibility in transferring funds among programs can become a request for general institutional rather than program support. Indeed, a number of people that we interviewed at the developing institutions made this request specifically. They questioned Title III's programmatic approach and made the point that what their institutions needed desparately was general support. These comments were often very clearly and specifically related to the "maintenance versus innovation issue," in our interviewees' comments that their desparate need was for basic maintenance support of their day-to-day operations rather than for flashy "gimmicks." While recognizing the great need for this type of support, it is clearly not congruent with the purposes of Title III. It is our impression that the present orientation in the administration of Title III probably represents the best possible compromise on this issue--namely, that support in Title III can be oriented toward particular types of programs with some flexibility in the interpretation and fund transfer issue by the Washington staff.

We have commented on the fairly universal perception among the people in these institutions, that the Washington staff consisted of people who were friendly, understanding, and concerned. There was very little of the usual complaint of Washington bureaucracy and federal interference. If anything, people at these institutions sometimes indicated that they would like more rather than less involvement from the Washington representatives. In a number of instances, they indicated that they could have used some help from the knowledgeable people in Washington. A high administrator in one of these institutions commented that since he had been asked to serve on some advisory board in Washington and had become well acquainted with the people in Title III, he had known the kinds of questions to ask them and had been able to use them much more than he had before. He indicated that their help had been invaluable. Some of the particular areas where people mentioned they could have used more help were for things like proposal writing, help in understanding the Title III guidelines, advice on cooperative relations and some of the particular programs they were undertaking.

We would concur with these comments and suggest that funding be available to provide the Washington staff with the increased personnel to enable it to play a more actively helpful role. We would stress that the role should be actively helpful. In many instances, people at the institutions are not even certain of the questions to ask. What is required is the coordination role that we have suggested the Washington administrators might play in our discussion of evaluation. This requires enough personnel to enable Washington to play an active leadership role in helping these institutions grapple with their problems and helping them make the particular programs maximally effective.

Limitations on travel have restricted institutional visits by the Washington staff to the serious detriment of the staff's ability to assist the program. We received indications that the institutions themselves would welcome and would benefit from visits from the Washington staff. Many developing institutions are isolated not only in programmatic, financial, or geographic way, but also from the kinds of expert advice and assistance which Washington staff members could give during institutional visits. Several members of the Washington staff are highly qualified experts on developing institutions, the problems they face, and the variety of solutions which have been tried with varying degrees of success. It is unfortunate that this expertise cannot be shared more fully and more often with additional institutions.

Developing institutions also have many questions about the administration of the Act itself--whether certain types of proposals are worthy of submission, the degree of flexibility which institutions have in administering the grants, the types of records which they should maintain, the types of intra-institutional controls which are (or are not) expected "by Washington", etc. Frequently, these are questions which the institution would not like to formalize to the extent of putting them in writing, but they could be handled easily and informally during institutional visitations. Although one might expect that the tendency would be for institutions to be more lax in their control than Washington would like, we observed examples of the opposite--institutional administrators or business managers who "played it safe" by imposing much stricter restrictions than probably are intended or even desired by the staff of the bureau in

Washinton. The result in some cases was impairment of program effectiveness--an impairment which people within the institution erroneously blamed on "Washington."

Problems in the Act Itself

As is noted at several points in this report, the lack of precise definition of "developing institutions" in the Act authorizing the program has created problems. It also is important to recognize that this gives the bureau administering the Act considerable flexibility which has real advantages in a new program. The program is able to grow and develop in accordance with its own experience without constant recourse to Congress.

An example of undesirable restrictiveness is the wording in the Act which implies that interinstitutional cooperation shall be the means through which the program is carried on. Interinstitutional cooperation can be extremely helpful in a large number of situations, but it is not necessarily the appropriate course to follow in every situation. Some developing institutions can be assisted by direct assistance to the individual institution without recourse to cooperative relationships involving other institutions. Under the interpretation of the Act which has been followed thus far, the only grants made "unilaterally" to individual institutions have been a subcategory of the National Teaching Fellow grants titled "Unilateral NTF's."

We are not qualified to judge whether the wording of the Act can be more flexibly interpreted. If it cannot, it would be advisable at some time to ask the Congress for authorization to provide assistance directly to individual institutions.

At the present time this restriction presents more of a procedural problem than a substantive one. Institutions which would like to submit single institution proposals arrange a close approximation to that by working out a bilateral cooperative proposal with another institution that they know will "cooperate" by leaving them largely alone. The accommodating, cooperating institution agrees to provide supporting services to the developing institution submitting the proposal (and may actually do so to the extent the developing institution requests such assistance), but the greatest service the cooperating institution provides is lending its name so that the proposal constitutes "interinstitutional cooperation" as required by the law (or current interpretation of the law). We saw more than one case in which the developing institution was genuinely and importantly assisted by a grant made in this fashion. We think it unfortunate that the extra paperwork was necessary to create the illusion of interinstitutional cooperation. It also is unfortunate that the implications of a legal subterfuge exist in these situations. Finally, and perhaps most important, it is unfortunate that open recognition cannot be given to an important form of institutional development--self-development. Open recognition of the possibility of self-development projects might encourage more institutions to undertake them.

Institutional self-study preliminary to major institutional reorganization constitutes one example of self-development which does not always require or even benefit from interinstitutional involvement. In one instance which we observed, this involved curricular reorganization and in another it involved administrative reorganization. In both cases the institution involved was reasonably strong. Such institutional strength probably is a necessary prerequisite to a successful single institution project.

5. Some Dilemmas Associated With the Developing Institutions Program

The Dilemma of Basic Support Versus New "Innovations"

A dilemma which faces the Developing Institutions Program is the unavoidable conflict between the overriding need which many developing institutions have for financial support for basic programs and personnel, and the emphasis in the Developing Institutions Program itself upon the provision of short-time federal assistance (one to several years) which will result in institutional improvements. The small size of the federal appropriations for the total Developing Institutions Program makes it impossible for the program to provide large amounts of basic support to institutions.

This problem is especially apparent in the case of the weaker institutions in the Developing Institutions group. For example, we observed a situation in which the standard class size in required lower division courses was in the neighborhood of 50 students and an experimental program on campus was providing faculty for small classes (20 or so) with intensive instruction. Faculty members in the experimental program also taught fewer classes in order to provide time for individual work with students. Attitudes on the campus were predictable. Many people questioned priorities - would the additional faculty members have been better utilized to teach in the regular program and reduce the average size of classes? Similar situations associated with other types of programs also could be cited to illustrate the point.

There is no question that these institutions need both basic support and innovative programs. The dilemma concerns not the institution but the federal Developing Institutions Program. Should the federal program attempt to provide limited amounts of basic support? The actual use of many of the National Teaching Fellows, especially unilateral National Teaching Fellows, makes it clear that institutions frequently used these new faculty positions for basic support in that they simply provided the institution with additional (needed) faculty who performed duties no different from those of other faculty members. The federal administrators of the Developing Institutions Program decided in recent years to reduce the number of National Teaching Fellowships being awarded, in part because of a policy decision that the limited amounts of monies available to the Developing Institutions Program should be used less for basic support and more for new innovations. We concur in this value judgment.

Limiting the proportion of Title III money available for basic support does not preclude a decision by the Congress to provide a large program of general basic support for struggling institutions should the Congress desire to do so, but it does reflect a judgment that when the Developing Institutions Program resources are limited, priority must be placed upon funding those programs which promise to make a permanent change in the institution rather than providing temporary relief.

The Dilemma of Defining What is "New"

A few of the programs supported by the Developing Institutions Program are new in a genuinely experimental sense. Once they are fully developed, they may have impact upon other institutions regardless of whether they fall in the "developing" category. This is not the case with the majority of grants under this program, however.

The typical grant under the Developing Institutions Program is designed to provide something which is new to the beneficiary institution (or institutions) but not new to better developed institutions. This is entirely appropriate because it will contribute to institutional development and, if successful, will make a permanent contribution to the future well-being of the institution.

An example that illustrates this is the Cooperative College Development Program which is designed to help participating institutions initiate and/or expand their own fund-raising programs through the utilization of fund-raising techniques which already exist in many other institutions. A surprising number of developing institutions make no attempt to systematically solicit financial support from their alumni, the local community in which they are located, or other obvious sources of continuing financial assistance. The development of such programs including the addition of staff personnel in each institution to operate them and the in-service training of these personnel will make a major contribution to the financial well-being of each member institution. The activity clearly is worthwhile, even though it is not a new development in higher education.

The Dilemma of Identifying the "Hopeless" Institution

One of the most difficult tasks in administering the Developing Institutions Program is identifying those institutions in the applicant group which are so weak that they should be denied assistance. Many applicant institutions fall in or near this category, but because of the fact that all developing institutions are by definition weak in some respects, the difficulty lies in deciding where to draw the line. The task is made particularly difficult because of the dramatic and highly publicized improvements which have occurred in a few institutions which only a few years ago were universally categorized as "hopeless." The catalyst for change in these institutions has been dynamic leadership which managed to bring in to the institution money and competent personnel.

One cannot help wondering whether each of the other institutions denied assistance because they are "hopeless" might turn out to be another exception. Even though this is possible, it is not likely in the case of most institutions so classified. When an institution can be accurately judged as hopeless, it is in the interests of all parties to encourage it to close and/or merge with a stronger institution. Such an action also conserves scarce Title III money for assignment to institutions with a better prognosis.

The Dilemma of Identifying the "Developed" Institution

Just as it is necessary to identify institutions which are so weak that they should not be assisted, so it also is necessary to identify institutions which are above the "developing" level for purposes of eligibility for funding. This is complicated by the fact that all institutions are continuously developing and changing. The semantics of the situation introduces difficulties, therefore.

In the past two years a reasonably good job has been done of identifying previously funded institutions which really were beyond the level of need typical of developing institutions. Most were phased out of the program. In our judgment, then, this dilemma does not constitute a current problem in the administration of the Act.

The Dilemma of When to "Graduate" a Developing Institution out of the Program

Since the Developing Institutions Program is designed to provide assistance for a limited number of years, it is necessary to decide when individual projects should be terminted (for federal funding purposes). In some cases, successful institutional development may proceed to the point that the institution itself is ready to "graduate" from eligibility for further funding under the program.

This will be complicated by several factors. Many types of institutions presently seem to have almost a permanent claim to eligibility because they are predominantly Negro, geographically isolated, or are culturally isolated by a long tradition of close relationship with the church. Such institutions can make dramatic and substantial progress with the assistance of Developing Institutions Program grants and still remain culturally isolated in some respects or financially less well off than the best financed institutions in the developing institutions group. Should this fact give them permanent eligibility, or is there a point at which they have made sufficient progress to warrant a decision that they must fend for themselves in the larger fund-raising world? One would assume that institutional graduation should take place at some point. The difficulty is deciding the cut-off point and insuring that such graduation does not constitute a "punishment for success" which contrasts with the treatment of institutions whose Title III funded programs may have worked out less successfully.

The Dilemma of Geographic Isolation

Geographic isolation is a problem about which only a limited number of things can be done. The handicaps in geographic isolation are real. It is appropriate for the Developing Institutions Program to address itself to the solution of those which are amenable to solution. Geographic isolation should not be allowed to provide a justification for indefinite eligibility or grants for programs which, given the fact of isolation, are not really susceptible to solution.

The Dilemma of Small Grants

Experience in the early years of the Developing Institutions Program provided considerable evidence that most small grants are relatively ineffective. The decision within the past several years to fund a smaller number of institutions with larger average grants is, in our opinion, wise. The larger grants have a far greater likelihood of significantly affecting the institution.

Some small grants are an exception to this generalization, of course. These should continue to be funded. The practice of making many small grants on the gamble that some of them will pay off has not worked out, however.

The Dilemma of Large Grants (Especially Multiple Large Grants)

A limited number of institutions are the beneficiaries of large grants from the Developing Institutions Program. In several cases these same institutions also are recipients of large grants from other governmental agencies and from private foundations. When the institution itself is small and struggling, these large grants taken together may constitute an alarmingly large percentage of the institution's total operating budget. The danger also is present that the institution's administrative capacity to make good use of them will be strained. These potential problems should be discussed in detail with the institutions themselves. The situation probably is least dangerous if the grants are enabling the institution to (1) attract a growing coterie of administrators, staff and faculty competent to handle the grants and (2) build an expanding base of continuing financial support from sources such as alumni and the local community.

Rapid institutional change always has dangers associated with it. When the Developing Institutions Program or any other major funding agency makes a large grant to a particular institution, it is gambling that the institution has a particularly good chance of success (or that the success will be particularly notable). This fact suggests its own ground rules: the granting agency should have above average confidence that the institution can successfully handle the grant (in terms of leadership and prognosis for long-term development) or that the potential benefits are important enough to warrant a greater than average gamble.

The Dilemma of Late Funding

A frequent institutional complaintin the first year or two of the Developing Institutions Program was the late date at which institutions were notified of grants. Late funding precluded effective recruiting for personnel to carry out grant-supported projects. In recent years the announcement date has come earlier in the year - typically about February. Institutions no longer complain about this date but indicate the desirability of still earlier notification.

A difficulty associated with an earlier notification date (e.g., mid-fall) would be the necessity for moving the application date earlier. Applications for renewal of projects would have to be submitted prior to the academic year in which they were operative; this would deprive both the institution and the Division of College Support of the opportunity to assess the program in actual operation.

The most desirable arrangement would be one in which appropriations were made to the agency a year in advance so that advance funding would be possible on those projects which appeared to warrant it (possibly on a contingent basis in some cases).

Funding for periods longer than a single year would be highly desirable in some types of activities. This already is done informally in terms of an understanding that the approved project is to extend over a series of years. The Developing Institutions Program in effect makes an informal commitment to fund it in future years even though the formal decision is made on an annual basis. This arrangement is not wholly satisfactory for the employment of staff, etc.

The Dilemmas of Long-Distance Cooperative Relationships (Bilaterals)

The most publicized bilaterals are those involving predominantly Negro institutions in the south and prestigious northern universities. Experience with these arrangements has varied dramatically from one bilateral to another, suggesting the pre-importance of the personalities involved. Even the most successful bilateral arrangements have inherent problems which must be noted.

The simple factor of distance precludes easy communication. Cooperative relationships necessitate a degree of planning and arranging in both institutions. The easy expansion of relationships to include larger numbers of people on a continuing or informal basis is extremely difficult. The fact that some of these arrangements have been successful speaks to the strong commitment which both institutions have to the relationship.

The cost of travel becomes a significant factor in long-distance cooperative relationships. Unless trips are made fairly frequently, the relationship cannot really become very intimate, yet if travel occurs frequently, it becomes expensive.

We conclude that bilateral arrangements have greater chance of success and are less expensive if they can be developed between institutions relatively close to one another. Relationships between institutions located far apart are justified when special considerations of expertise or willingness to cooperate make the long-distance relationship preferable to one with a nearby institution. In the case of existing bilateral arrangement, the reservoir of understanding and establishing working relationships suggests the desirability of continuance for as long as the participating institutions believe the arrangement is profitable.

The particular sensitivity of predominantly Negro institutions to arrangements which are patronizing or domineering has been alluded to elsewhere in this report. It is an issue of crucial importance in determining the success of many bilaterals. Successful bilaterals are characterized by mutual respect between institutional officials and the staff and faculty from both institutions involved in the cooperative arrangement.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The general policy of emphasizing moderate and large grants and de-emphasizing small grants is wise, and we would encourage a continuation of this policy. The rationale for it is that small grants to many institutions have very limited impact. The exceptions to such a policy should be cases in which there is some specific reason to believe that the requested grant would have significant impact in spite of its small size.

The cutback in National Teaching Fellows which was made a couple of years ago was a wise move and should be continued and possibly carried still further. The majority of NTF's appear to assist the institution in an immediate way but do not benefit the institution in ways that extend beyond the year in which they are funded. A limited number of NTF's serve a more important purpose in that their availability is utilized by the institution to do something which will have a permanent residual benefit. This may entail freeing a faculty member while he completes his own university studies, the development of a new curriculum field within the institution, etc. The common characteristic of these permanently significant uses of NTF's is that the NTF positions are simply one part of a larger plan for institutional improvement. We heartily endorse the use of NTF's when they contribute to a permanent improvement in the institution. We place very low priority on the use of NTF's for temporary institutional support.

Greater emphasis should be given to programs fostering administrative improvement because this affects so many other aspects of institutional development. Many facets of administration are susceptible to improvement activities and to a certain extent the choice among them must be based upon opportunity factors. However, we also suggest that the Division of College Support actively encourage the submission of administrative improvement proposals even to the point of initiating their development. Among the likely possibilities are efforts to improve institutional business and financial management, academic planning and administration, and efforts to improve the performance of specialists in many jobs such as purchasing, physical plant operation and maintenance, registrats' offices, etc.

The requirement that all activities funded under Title III (except unilateral NTF's) involve interinstitutional cooperation should be modified so that individual institutions can submit individual requests. We would expect that the majority of the projects funded would continue to be interinstitutional, but we think there should be room for funding individual institutions when this seems the best way to get a job done. The present requirement causes some institutions to enter into interinstitutional arrangements which are not necessary and sometimes are "in name only."

Some bilateral arrangements are not particularly dependent upon assistance from the cooperating institution and represent situations in thich the bilateral exists principally to meet the requirement that the proposal be interinstitutional in order to receive funding. Bilateral arrangements which genuinely require assistance from the cooperating institution frequently are marred by an inadequate degree of commitment on the part of the cooperating institution and/or an inadequate appreciation of the extent and types of investment (especially of personnel) which the cooperating institution must be prepared to make. This suggests the necessity for carefully screening bilateral proposals for evidence that the cooperating institution actually is prepared and able to provide the type and amount of assistance which is intended. The visibility of bilaterals also appears to depend upon the maximum degree of initiative and operating responsibility resting with the develping institution. This further complicates the possibilities of obtaining the desired type and amount of commitment from the cooperating institution and argues further for carefully reviewing proposals to ascertain that the cooperating institution knows what it is committing itself to and is capable of fulfilling that commitment. A stringent review may reduce the number of bilaterals funded, but it should help to insure that those funded will be successful.

Bilateral arrangements involving institutions at great distance from each other are more difficult to administer for many reasons. Therefore, other things being equal, relationships between institutions more accessible to one another should be encouraged for reasons of convenience and because of the possibility for expanding the number of activities and maintaining the relationship for a long time. We recognize, however, that there are cases in which other things are not equal because of the particular needs and capabilities of the institutions or because effective working relationships have become well established despite distance. In such cases, the establishment or continuation of long-distance relationships should be considered acceptable.

An evaluation of the effectiveness of consortia arrangements that utilize a central staff should be based in part upon an evaluation of the effectiveness of the working relationship between the consortia staff and the institutions. Although the ultimate judgment concerning program effectiveness must be based upon the final end-product - program impact upon students or institutions - the quality of the end-product is the result of other factors including the staff-institutional relationships. When these relationships are less than adequate, the fact should be taken into account in making judgments about renewing grants and it should also be a subject for concern and even action by the Division of College Support during the course of an existing grant.

Most consortia of any size or complexity need a well-defined arrangement for the provision of leadership and staff services. Generally these conditions are not met by arrangements under which one member institution simply provides this on a volunteer basis. Institutional needs necessarily come first, and the consortia work is in danger of being neglected. There should be specific provision within the consortia for whatever staff personnel are needed.

There is considerable promise in consortia arrangements which enable a group of institutions to draw upon specialized expertise from a staff which is outside any of the member institutions. The Thirteen College-ISE arrangement is a prototype of this, and there are several others. Not all of these consortia were equally effective, but the basic organizational device seems unusually sound. Extremely important to their success is the definite commitment of a meaningful amount of time by the outside experts plus the arrangements for a significant amount of interaction on a continuing basis between the affected staff people in the member institutions and the expert staff. The ISE summer conferences provide one example of this which looked particularly effective.

In general, we found institutional attitudes toward the Division of College Support to be positive. An increased amount of leadership and consultative assistance from Washington would be welcomed by many of the institutions and is often urgently needed. Additional staff and removal of travel restrictions in the Division of College Support are necessary if such services are to be provided.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of individual projects can best be made by procedures built into the original design of the activity when it is undertaken. Only a few projects had plans for careful evaluation. Institutions should be urged to increase their attention to this important activity and a much higher priority should be given to funding for evaluation. The major purpose of evaluation should be to provide feedback that will enable continual adaptations and improvements of projects and approaches for the benefit of all institutions dealing with similar problems. This calls for evaluation research that follows a parallel design across a number of institutions. This cross-institutional research will require a major commitment and coordinative role if we are to learn systematically from the experiences in these first years of the operation of Title III.

The total appropriation for the Title III program should be increased. There is not enough money to do the job.

SELECTED LIST OF RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Boyer, Ernest L. "Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Exchange of Instructional Materials." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1967, 281-285. (Speech at 1967 AAHE Conference)

Coleman, J. S. and staff. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Egerton, John. "Salvation May Depend on Definition," *Southern Education Report*, Jan./Feb., 1968, 2-9. (Description of the Title III program)

Evan, William M. "Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Relation." In Thompson, James D. *Approaches to Organizational Design*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966.

Fichter, Joseph H. *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges--Class of 1964*. Prepared for the National Institutes of Health with joint sponsorship by the U.S. Department of Labor and National Science Foundation. Public Health Service Publication no. 1571. 1967.

Greeley, Andrew M. *The Changing Catholic College*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Gurin, Patricia and Katz, Daniel. *Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College*. Final report to the U.S. Office of Education. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1966.

Howard, Lawrence C. *The Developing Colleges Program: A Study of Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965*. Final report of Project no. 6-1437, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Milwaukee: Institute of Human Relations, The University of Wisconsin, 1967.

__________. (ed.) *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education*. Proceedings of the Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 3-4, 1967.

*__________. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education*. New Dimensions in Higher Education, no. 21. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

Jaffe, A. J.; Adams, Walter; and Meyers, Sandra G. "The Sharply Stratified World of the Negro Colleges," *College Board Review*, Winter 1967-68, 66, 20-28.

__________. *Negro Higher Education in the 1960's*. Praeger Special Studies in U.S. Economic and Social Developments. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1968.

---

*This is a definitive survey of the literature and annotated bibliography on interinstitutional cooperation; items are not duplicated on this list. A copy is also available as part of the Wingspread Conference report, immediately preceding on this list.

Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1968.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Liberal Education, March 1968 issue. Contains a series of articles on interinstitutional cooperation.

Lippitt, Ronald; Watson, Jeanne; and Westley, Bruce. The Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1958.

McGrath, Earl J. The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Miles, Mathew B. "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations." In Miles, Mathew B. (ed.) Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Chapter 25, pp. 631-662.

Moore, Raymond E. Consortiums in American Higher Education: 1965-66; Report of an Exploratory Study. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Special Report and Recommendations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovation. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Strengthening Developing Institutions: Regulations. (Revised) Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington: 1967.